This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

12413
22

HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY.

12413.22

Harvard College Library

FROM THE FUND OF

CHARLES MINOT

(Class of 1828).

Received 15 Nov., 1889.

8982

A STUDY OF THE ANGLO-SAXON POEM, THE HARROWING OF HELL.

(GREIN'S HÖLLENFAHRT CHRISTI.)

DISSERTATION

FOR

THE ACQUISITION OF THE DEGREE

OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

FROM THE

UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG

BY

JAMES HAMPTON KIRKLAND,

OF SPARTANBURG, S. C., U. S. A.

HALLE.

EHRHARDT KARRAS, PRINTER.

1885.

12483.22

NOV 15 1889
LIBRARY

Minot fund.

CONTENTS.

Introduction.
§ 1. Summary of Opinion.
§ 2. Sources of the Poem.
§ 3. Cynewulf's Treatment of his Sources.
§ 4. Style of the Poem.
§ 5. Vocabulary and Grammatical Examination.
§ 6. Epithets and Phrases.
§ 7. Versification.

Introduction.

The task attempted in the following paper is no easy one. The ground we tread is slippery, and the chances of erring are numerous. To settle questions of authorship from internal evidence demands a close examination of all facts, and allows no choice of argument or sifting of material. The art of picking isolated incidents and basing arguments upon them is one that has been only too well understood and too often practised by those who have entered into such discussions. And after all, there remains somewhat of uncertainty attached to all such investigations. An author's language cannot be bound with iron bands, nor can we prophecy with mathematical exactness the very point at which a given word, construction, or figure must reappear. Dissimilarities of diction, within liberal limits, are not conclusive proof of separate authorship, nor can the contrary always be established by slight similarities of language. In addition to these general difficulties there is added, in the especial case before us, the fact, that we have to do with a mere fragment. Could we have the whole poem as it came fresh from its author's hand, many of the obscurities that now puzzle us would doubtless be cleared up. As it is, the question is often one of probabilities and there is little room for dogmatic assertion. If, in the course of this examination, space has sometimes been given to apparent trifles, it has been done from a desire to omit nothing that could affect the argument or aid to a decision of the question proposed. The various helps that have been used are referred to as occasion requires. Grein's Sprachschatz is of course the source of most of the citations under § 5. In some rare cases I have been able to add to Grein's enumeration examples

culled from my own reading. It might have been possible, to a limited extent, to take into consideration the usage of prose writers, but as this could not be done with anything like consistency or completeness, it has been thought best to confine the examination to the usage of the poets. The papers on the Cynewulf question that have appeared within the past decade by Charitius, Fritzsche, Gaebler, and Lefèvre have all been of service as pointing out the best method of conducting an investigation of the present kind. The second part of Gu. has been reckoned among C.'s genuine works (CW.). This has been done after a careful consideration of all that has been written on the subject, and in consequence of private investigation. It will be noticed, though, that no argument is dependent for its main strength on any quotation from Gu.; take these all away and the position of the whole discussion remains unchanged.

§ 1. Summary of Opinion.

The poem called by Thorpe 'The Harrowing of Hell', but which is more generally known under the name given by Grein, 'Die Höllenfahrt Christi', is contained in the Exeter Book, one of the donations of Bishop Leofric to the library of his Cathedral at Exeter. No mention of this Ms. was made from the date of its delivery to the Cathedral till Wanley published in 1705 his Catalogue of A.-S. Manuscripts. Still more serviceable was the notice given by Conybeare, first in several communications read before the Society of Antiquaries[1]), and then in his great work 'Illustrations of Anglo-Saxon Poetry'. In the year 1842 the Ms. was published for the Society of Antiquaries of London under the title:

Codex Exoniensis. A Collection of Anglo-Saxon Poetry, from a Ms. in the Library of the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, with an English Translation, by Benj. Thorpe. London, 1842.

Our poem stands in this edition p. 459—467; its position in the Ms. is 119[b]—122[a]. Thorpe made no attempt to supply the missing words of the text, which unfortunately are quite

---

[1]) Published in Archaeologia, or Miscellaneous Tracts relating to Antiquity, vol. 17. London, 1814.

numerous on these pages, but printed the poem just as it stood in the Ms., and with tolerable faithfulness. These missing words were first supplied by Grein, who gave a readable text in the first volume of his Bibliothek.[1]) Other corrections and suggestions were given by Grein in his Sprachschatz and still further in an especial article, Zur Textkritik der angelsächsischen Dichter, Germania X, p. 416—429.

A collation of Thorpe's edition with the Ms. was made in 1870/71 by Schipper and the results published Germania XIX, p. 327—339. So much for the text.

As regards the authorship of H., Thorpe expressed no opinion[2]), nor did he notice the connection in contents between this poem and the one printed by him p. 32 ff. The fact that the runes in Jul. and Cri., as well as those in El., formed the name Cynewulf, he had learned from Kemble. Dietrich in a masterly article, Haupt IV, p. 193—214, proved that all the poems printed by Thorpe p. 1—103 form one connected whole, to which he gave the name of Crist. In this same article H. is noticed and with captivating boldness the writer says: 'Ich gehe noch weiter, Cynewulf, ich weiss es, dichtete auch das kleine herrliche Lied von der Ankunft des Himmelskönigs in der Unterwelt, worin ihn, den Erlöser auch der Frommen des alten Bundes, Johannes der Täufer als Herold begrüsst, der sich rühmt der Rüstung, die er von seinem lieben Herrn schon empfangen, und dass er zusammen mit ihm im Jordan habe baden dürfen, und zusammen mit ihm die Welt durch die Taufe selig erregt habe. Dieses Seitenstück zu dem frühern dreifachen Ankommen Christi mag allerdings später entstanden sein, da der gute Verband dieser drei Lieder zu einem Ganzen keine Stelle zeigt, wo es gleich anfangs hätte eingereiht sein können'.

The proofs of this statement, though halfway promised by D., were never brought forward. The Cynewulf question

---

[1]) Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie von C. W. M. Grein. Erster Band. Text I. Göttingen, 1857.

[2]) That is, in his edition of the Cod. Ex. Later he attributed the whole of the Exeter Hs. to Cynewulf; cf. The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church: By Benj. Thorpe. Vol. I. London, 1844. p. 622.

was examined by him in later years, but he does not touch our poem.

The connection of H. with the Evangelium Nicodemi was first shown by Wülcker in the work: Das Evangelium Nicodemi in der abendländischen Literatur. Paderborn, 1872. He says p. 13: 'Im letzten viertel des 8. jahrhunderts entstand, vielleicht von Cynewulf verfasst, ein gedicht, welches die höllenfahrt Christi umfasste. Leider ist es nur bruchstückweise erhalten. Aus dem überlieferten lässt sich aber erkennen, dass das gedicht auf unserm evangelium beruhte, wenn auch die ausführung im einzelnen sehr frei ist'. In his latest work on the subject Prof. Wülcker suggests it as possible that the author of H. knew the Ev. Nic. only at second hand.[1])

We come now to Grein's view as found in his Collegienheft of 1874, though not published till 1880. Kurzgefasste angelsächsische Grammatik von Prof. Dr. C. W. M. Grein, Kassel 1880.

After speaking of Crist he says, p. 12: 'Daran reiht sich noch in einem besonderen, freilich nur unvollständig überlieferten Lied von der Höllenfahrt Christi die im Crist nur vorübergehend angedeutete Ankunft des Himmelskönigs in der Unterwelt am Auferstehungsmorgen. Vielleicht bildete das Lied ursprünglich einen integrierenden Teil des Crist (vor v. 558)'.

We must tarry awhile by this expression of opinion, for there are many reasons that forbid our thinking that H. once formed an integral part of Crist. Grein does not specify exactly where he would insert our poem, but simply says before v. 558. We may presume that he means somewhere after v. 440, since here the second division of Cri., which treats of the ascension, commences. Now we search in vain for any place between 440 and 557 where such a poem as H. can be inserted. The transition from the first to the second part is made naturally but suddenly. We are by one step transferred from Christ's birth to the day of his ascension. No description of the intervening events is given; the fact of his resurrection is only alluded to in one line (v. 467); his crucifixion is not hinted at; only the circumstances of the ascension are given

---

[1]) Grundriss zur Geschichte der angelsächsischen Litteratur von Rich. Wülcker. Erste Hälfte. Leipzig, 1885. s. 187.

with fullness of detail. Immediately thereafter follows the appearance of the two angels to the watching disciples, who prophecy concerning Christ's return to judge the world. Joy is renewed in Heaven and the disciples return sad to Jerusalem. Then the author returns to the question he had himself proposed (v. 447 ff.) and gives the proper answer. On account then of this perfect connection between all the parts of this passage, H. cannot be inserted between 440 and 457, and the only place left for it is just before v. 558. But it suits no better there. What would be the appropriateness of an author's relating the ascension with elaborate detail, and then returning to events that transpired forty days previously and telling of the resurrection and descent to Hades with still more detail and circumstance? Such a procedure is unthinkable. Grein seems to have been led to his surmise by the fact that the passage in Cri. (558—585) might make a suitable close for H., and forgot to enquire whether H. suits for the remaining part of Cri. The passage however, suits equally well for Cri. and is highly appropriate just where it is.

Let us notice closely the connection of the various incidents at this part of the poem. The main description of the ascension is finished with v. 532; the story is then carried forward ten days, for we are told that the disciples waited this length of time at Jerusalem. But there is ground left behind to be cleared up, and the poet returns with v. 544 to the incidents already narrated. With one stroke of the pen he recalls the coming of the angels, the triumphal procession into the heavenly city, and the 'welcome Guest' sitting upon his throne ruling earth, heaven; and — plainly the the third subject of dominion is missing, namely hell. But no, it is not missing. The very next line (v. 528) adds it and the picture of Christ's domain is complete. The mention of hell brings up the descent of Christ to Hades, and the poet gives us in the next ten lines not an epic description, for the narrative has already advanced forty days beyond the time of this event, but a summing up in a few words of the great results of that conflict. Here the poet is led simply and naturally to the main subject on his mind, the ascension. The *'folces unrîm'* that Christ had drawn from hell was the same band that met him

in the clouds and for the third time the poem returns to that incident. This third description, though short, is the most rhetorical of all. The poet sees everything transpiring before his eyes. He stands amid the band of disciples and addresses to them the words (v. 570): *þe ge hêr onstariað.*[1])

Now his vision sweeps beyond the advancing procession to the end of the journey (571—578), and in the height of his poetical flight he calls on the angels in Heaven to open the gates for the King and his train (573—581). Then follows a hymn of praise and thanksgiving (581—600) closing with the words:

wuldor þæs âge,
þrŷnysse þrym þonc bûtan ende.

Out of this examination it follows; first, that Grein's division no. XIII is unwarranted, and no. XII must be extended to v. 600; secondly, that the whole of the passage 558—586 is not an address to the angels, but only 573—581; thirdly, that the connection between v. 557 and 558 ff. is of the closest kind and allows no insertion such as H.

That Grein's theory was not accepted by ten Brink appears clearly from the following passage[2]): 'Die Höllenfahrt Christi, von der im Christ gelegentlich der Himmelfahrt die Rede ist, machte Cynewulf zum Gegenstand einer besondern Dichtung, deren schwungvoller und gedankenreicher Anfang uns bedauern lässt, dass der Rest verloren gegangen ist'.

We cannot but regret that the plan of ten Brink's work did not allow him to add whatever proofs were at hand for his opinion as to the authorship of our poem. In conclusion it is sufficient to call attention to a curious mistake in Müller's Angelsächsische Grammatik[3]) (p. 23) where H. ist substituted for Sat. This is of course due to carelessness.

---

[1]) These words are an exact repetition of the words of the angel v. 521, and are nothing more than a poetical way of stating what might be expressed thus: þisne ilcan þrêat þe þâ þegnas onstaredon. But had it been so expressed, the picture that immediately follows (570—581) would have been well nigh impossible.

[2]) Geschichte der englischen Litteratur von Bernhard ten Brink. Band I. Berlin, 1877. s. 71.

[3]) Angelsächsische Grammatik von Dr. Theodor Müller, herausgeg. von Dr. H. Hilmer. Göttingen, 1883.

§ 2. Sources of the Poem.

Our poem falls naturally into two parts; first, an introduction, alluding to Christ's crucifixion and telling of the coming of the women to the sepulchre on the morning of the third day; second, the Descensus proper, preceeded by a short description of the resurrection. That the canonical gospels, and not the Gesta Pilati, were the basis for the first part, is quite clear.

In general Matthew seems to be more closely followed than any one of the Evangelists. He is the only one that mentions two women as going to the sepulchre. Luke (24, 1) does not specify the number; Mark (16, 1) gives the names of three, and John (20, 1) mentions only one. The following references give the scriptural basis for the account in H:

v. 1, Luke 24, 1; v. 2. 3, Luke 23, 55. Mark 15, 47. Matth. 27, 61; v. 7. 8, Matth. 27, 64 and 5; v. 9. 10, Matth. 28, 1; v. 17—23, Matth. 28, 2 ff.

The second part of the poem begins with v. 23, and commences a narration of the occurrences that are told in the Evangelium Nicodemi[1]) perhaps more explicitly than in any of the remnants of the early Christian literature. In order to decide whether the author of H. used this work as a basis for his poem, it will be necessary to note more closely the contents of Ev. Nic. and compare therewith the account given in our poem. The order of events in H. is as follows.

As soon as Christ rises from the grave, the fact is in some way disclosed to John the Baptist, who gives vent to his joy and announces to his companions in Hades their approaching deliverance. At the same time Christ has started on his journey, alone and unaccompanied, against the powers of darkness. At his approach the locks are burst, the bars are broken, and Adam, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Esaias, Sacharias, and the other imprisoned spirits throng to meet him. John too sees his Master's approach and begins his song of welcome and praise, in the midst of which the poem breaks off.

---

[1]) By Ev. Nic. is meant more especially the second part which narrates the Descensus Christi ad Inferos.

Let us now turn to the Evangelium Nicodemi and see how the facts are there narrated. The following summary is divided according to the two groups of the Lat. Mss.[1])

A.

As all the patriarchs are sitting in darkness in the depths of hell, a golden light suddenly penetrates the gloom. Esaias repeats a prophecy in regard to Christ; Simeon mentions the incident in the temple, and John tells of the baptism of Christ and how he has been sent to announce his coming. Seth, at Adam's command, narrates his interview with Michael at the gates of Paradise, whereupon all the hearers rejoice with great joy. Satan and Inferus discuss the coming of Christ and the advisability of allowing him to enter. In the midst of their discussion a voice rings out 'Tollite portas . . . et introibit rex gloria'. Inferus and his companions prepare to oppose Christ's entrance, while David and Esaias repeat prophecies in regard to Christ, and all the saints demand that the gates be opened. The cry, 'Tollite portas', is again heard, and Christ enters in the form of a man. Satan is delivered into the power of Inferus in the place of the redeemed, who are liberated. Christ calls Adam and the saints to himself and addresses them with words of kindness, whereupon they all join in ascriptions of praise. Then, amidst songs of thanksgiving from David, Habakkuk, and the other prophets, they are escorted by Michael within the portals of Paradise.

B.

While the speaker Karinus and his companions are sitting in the shadow of death, a great light is seen and the gates of hell tremble. A voice proclaims, 'Rex gloriae Christus Dominus intraturus adveniet'. Satan and his ministers prepare to resist, while Adam announces a speedy deliverance. The saints are comforted by the boldness of Adam who thereupon calls on Seth to narrate his interview with Michael at the gates of Paradise. Isaiah tells how he had prophecied concerning Christ while on earth. John tells how he had baptized him and says, 'Ego ab eo responsum accepi quia ipse descensurus esset ad inferos'. David, Jeremiah, and the other prophets and patriarchs begin to repeat their own prophecies concerning Christ and all the saints exulting cry; 'Alleluia, benedictus qui veniet in nomine domini'. Again is heard a voice 'Tollite portas . . . et introibit rex gloriae'. One of the thieves crucified with Christ enters bearing a cross and announces the near approach of his Master. The saints, led on by David, are about to seize Satan and tear him in pieces, when Christ enters. After binding Satan and sending him 'in profundum abyssi', Christ salutes Adam with the words: 'Pax tibi cum filiis tuis'. Adam and Eve pour out their thanks at his feet and all the redeemed shout his praises. The cross is set up as a sign of victory and that

[1]) Evangelia Apocrypha, collegit atque recensuit Constantinus de Tischendorf. Editio altera. Lipsiae, 1876. Praef. p. 75—77.

portion of the imprisoned spirits that has passed the scrutiny of Christ ascends with him from the depths of darkness to light.

Comparing now the facts as narrated in H. with the account in the Evangelium Nicodemi, we notice quite a variation; indeed, in the detailed arrangement, there is little or no agreement. This variation is chiefly in the way of omission on the part of H. As early as the 40th line we are told of Christ's entrance into the lower regions; the only event mentioned as preceeding it is John the Baptist's address foretelling Christ's near approach. On the other hand, see how much more is narrated in the Evangelium Nicodemi. In group A, Christ's entrance does not find mention till cap. 5, and in group B, till cap. 8. Before this occurs a light is seen and a voice is heard; Esaias, Simeon, Adam, John the Baptist, Jeremiah, and other of the prophets announce the speedy coming of Christ; Inferus and Satan discuss the advisability of granting admittance to one who had shown himself able to raise Lazarus from the dead; again the cry rings out, 'Tollite portas principes vestras et elevamini portae aeternales et introibit rex gloriae', and then at last Christ enters. The latter portion of H. (40—137) is taken up with an address of welcome by John the Baptist. Not one word has as yet been spoken by Christ, nor by the saints expecting deliverance, nor by the devils awaiting their punishment. In the Ev. Nic. Christ adopts the initiative immediately upon his entrance, and not until Satan is overthrown do the saints give vent to words of praise, in which connection, however, no mention is made of John the Baptist. That the overthrow of Satan and these other incidents were fully treated in H. we are bound to believe; to what length the work was carried out, or whether a closer use of the Ev. Nic. appeared in the latter portions, are questions that have been forever silenced by the unfortunate loss of the concluding part of the poem.

As the result of this comparison, we may settle upon a few points as quite probable.

I. H. is no translation of the Ev. Nic., nor is it based upon it in the same sense in which El. and Jul. are based upon their respective sources. This is proved,

1. by the fact, that many occurrences narrated in Ev. Nic. are omitted in H.: especially the narrative of Seth, the various prophecies of Esaias and others, and the discussion between Satan and Inferus;
2. by the fact, that other important incidents are brought in which have no place in the Evangelium Nicodemi; and this is true not only of the first part of the poem, but also of the second part, which treats of the Descensus proper.

II. The author of H. probably knew and had read the Evangelium Nicodemi. This is shown,

1. by the fact; that despite the above mentioned variations, H. shows a nearer resemblance to the Ev. Nic. than to any other of the many treatises on the same subject current at that time[1]);
2. by the fact, that one passage in H. betrays a tolerably close agreement with a passage in the Ev. Nic. and renders it not improbable that the author of our poem had read the Latin version. The passage is H. 26 ff.:

Hæfde me gehâten hælend ûser,
þâ he me on þisne sîð sendan wolde,
þæt he me gesôh[te ymb seofan[2])] mônað,
ealles folces fruma: nu [is se fyrst] sceacen;
wêne ic ful swîðe and witod [talige],
[þætte ûs] tô dæge dryhten wille
sylfa gesêcan, sigebearn godes.

With this compare the following passage taken from group A, cap. II (Tischendorf p. 393): Et nunc praeivi ante faciem eius et descendi annuntiare vobis quia in proximo est visitare nos ipse oriens filius dei ex alto veniens, sedentibus nobis in tenebris et umbra mortis.

What I regard as the true theory of the composition of H. may be stated in a few words. It seems very likely that the author, whoever he was, sat down to write his poem with no work before him for a guide, but with the facts of the

---

[1]) This argument has its limitations in the limitations of our knowledge as to what was really current at that time.

[2]) Vid. Grein's article in Germania X, S. 421.

case, the material for his work, all stored away in his mind, and with an imagination kindled possibly by extensive reading on the subject. This material was gathered principally from the Bible and the Ev. Nic., while many a homily or poem may have contributed some thought to the work or lent some coloring to the picture. John, the fore-runner of Christ on earth, he had learned from his Bible; what more natural then than that the prophecy of John to the saints should be the very one selected out of all those mentioned in the Ev. Nic.; and what more natural than that he should be chosen as the *'burgwarena ord'* to welcome the approaching Master.

That the author of H. was Cynewulf I regard as probable from the following consideration.[1])

This subject had entered quite deeply into the mind of Cynewulf, as is apparent from the various allusions to it scattered throughout his works. While writing the Riddles, the story must have been known to him, as appears from the following quotation:

R. 56, 5, and rôde tâcn, þæs us tô roderum up
hlǽdre rǽrde, ǽr he helwara
burg âbrǽce.

The frequency with which the theme is mentioned in Crist makes the supposition not at all unlikely that H. was Cynewulf's next work. The passages are Cri. 144 ff. 448 ff. 730 ff. 1160 ff.

So also Gu. 1074:

— dryhten mid drêame, þâ he of dêaðe ârâs
onweald of eorðan in þâ êastortîd,
ealra þrymma þrym, þrêata mǽstne
tô heofonum âhôf, þâ he from helle âstâg.

In Jul. and El. the narrative is kept closer in hand, but the lines El. 181—82 refer probably to this event:

âlŷsde lêoda bearn of locan dêofla,
gêomre gâstas, etc.

The question naturally presents itself here, whether there were other works at hand, containing allusions to the Descent

---

[1]) I am aware that this argument would be of little importance standing alone; taken however in connection with the special arguments drawn from the language of the poem it must be allowed some weight.

of Christ, which might have served as a basis for our poem. That this story was extensively spread in the literature of the early Christian Church is a well known fact. It meets us continually in the writings of the Fathers, and was often made the subject of spirited controversy. Ittigius[1]) says (p. 14): Haec enim sententia in scriptis Patrum tam frequens est, ut Isidorus Hispalensis inter haereticos numeraverit, qui in Christi ad inferos descensu animarum liberationem factam negant.

In most of these writers, however, the opinions expressed and the discussions carried on are based upon the passages in the Bible that refer to this event (especially Eph. 4, 8—9; 1 Petr. 3, 19 and 4, 6), and not till several centuries have elapsed do we find a circumstantial narrative such as is contained in the Ev. Nic. It would be useless to give quotations from these patristic writings; they may be found in any quantity in modern theological writers. Ittigius in the work above referred to[2]), gives references to Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Gregorius Nazianzenus, Venerable Bede etc.

In Eusebius[3]) a well developed story meets us almost as soon as in the Ev. Nic., and some of the details are even more fully described. Thus the descent of John the Baptist to Hades to announce Christ's coming is made the subject of an especial oration, and is treated with considerably more detail than in the Ev. Nic. The title of this oration is: *Τοῦ μακαρίου Εὐσεβίου ἐν τῷ ᾅδῃ καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖσε ἐγκεκλεισμένων.* The Descensus Christi, which was probably originally an independent oration, has now fallen together with another one in which is told: '*περὶ τῆς συμβολίας τοῦ διαβόλου τῆς πρὸς τὸν ᾅδην*' (p. 14 l. 15). The title of the two orations now clumsily united

[1]) De Evangelio Mortuis annunciato, ad 1 Petr. II, 6, exercitatio Theologica. Lipsiae, 1699.

[2]) Vid. especially § XIX, p. 14 and § XXIV, p. 20. For further literature on the subject see: Die Lehre von Christi Höllenfahrt, J. L. König, Frankfurt a. M., 1842, s. 260 ff. Literature of a Doctrine of a Future Life, Ezra Abbott, New York, 1871. For access to the last mentioned work I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Caspar René Gregory, of Leipzig University.

[3]) Eusebii Emeseni quae supersunt Opuscula Graeca et Adnotationibus Historicis et Philologicis illustrata a Jo. Christiano Guilelmo Augusti. Elberfeldi, 1829.

is, '*Τῇ μεγάλῃ παρασκευῇ τοῦ μακαρίου Εὐσεβίου λόγος εἰς τὸν διάβολον καὶ εἰς τὸν ᾅδην μετὰ τὸ παραδοῦναι ὁ Ἰούδας τὸν Κύριον*'. The Descensus proper commences in the middle of p. 25. The relation of these orations to the Ev. Nic. is treated in the notes (p. 126 and 163 ff.), but the editor is unable to decide which is the later and so the borrowed work, or whether they are both drawn 'ex communi traditionis fonte'. As to the age of Eusebius he observes (p. 68): De aevo igitur, quo vixit, nullum est dubium; de anno autem, quo natus et mortuus, non satis constat .... Certissimum hoc, ut etiam Phil. Labbeus (de script. eccl. T. I, p. 310) observavit: 'Vixit tempore Constantii Imper. sub quo mortuus et Antiochae sepultus est, ideoque saltem ante annum 361 vivere desiit'. The correctness of this date depends on whether the orations belong to Eusebius Emisenus or Eusebius of Alexandria, a question that cannot be entered into here.[1]) Tischendorf regards them as the work of the latter and says (Prolog p. LXVIII): 'Ex ipso vero libello nostro, qui tum nondum cum actis Pilati coniunctus esse videtur, prae aliis multis hausit, nulla quidem alieni mentione facta, Eusebius Alexandrinus.[2])

In the works of Epiphanius[3]), Bishop of Constantia in Cyprus, who flourished toward the close of the fourth century, we find the Descensus treated p. 259—275: 'Oratio in Christi Sepulturam et Domini in inferum descensum'.[4]) The version here given agrees in many points with the Ev. Nic., though there is also much divergence. The cause of Christ's Descent is stated (p. 268) to be, 'ut educat eos, qui a saeculo vincti sunt'. Among the imprisoned ones are mentioned by name Adam, Eve, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Joseph, Moses, Daniel, Jere-

---

[1]) See Thilo: Ueber die Schriften des Eusebius von Alexandrien und des Eusebius von Emisa, 1832.

[2]) For exactly the opposite opinion see, Nouvelles recherches sur l'époque à laquelle a été composé l'ouvrage connu sous le nom d'Evangile de Nicodème par Alfred Maury. Paris, 1850.

[3]) Epiphanii Opera. Paris, 1622. T. II.

[4]) This title, as well as the quotations which follow, has been given, for the sake of convenience, in the Latin version of Stanislaus Phoenicius which accompanies the original Greek in the edition just referred to. The genuineness of this oration is doubtful; it may belong to an Epiphanius of later date.

miah, Jonas, David, Solomon; finally, 'Illic et magnus ipse Joannes, major omnibus prophetis, tanquam in tenebroso utero Christum praedicans iis, qui in inferno erant omnibus; duplex praecursor et praeco virorum et mortuorum'. The description of Christ's entrance is highly rhetorical, and here Christ comes not alone but accompanied by a host of ministers (Potestates Domini). Adam hears his approach and announces a speedy deliverance to his companions. Christ on his entrance delivers quite an extended address and invites all the saints to ascend with him to Paradise.

In the *Καθημερινῶν* of Prudentius[1]) (348—410 A. D.) we find the Descent of Christ alluded to, though not with much detail. The 9th Hymn is entitled 'Hymnus Omni Hora', but the contents will be more readily understood from the title with which Fabricius characterized it, viz. 'Paean de vita et morte Christi'.[2]) Here we have some of the most striking facts and circumstances in the life of Christ mentioned and among them the Descensus. In v. 70 we have the following statement: Quin et ipsum, ne salutis inferi expertes forent, Tartarum benignus intrat.

About the same date we have a poem of somewhat greater compass entitled, 'Val. Faltoniae Probae, Centones Virgiliani'.[3]) In the second part of the poem the crucifixion, descent to Hades, resurrection, and ascension are all treated at some length. The descent to Hades is mentioned col. 815—16.

In the same volume of Migne are printed the works of Caelius Sedulius[4]), who lived not many years later than Prudentius and Proba. In his 'Paschale carmen', Lib. V, 427 ff.[5]), the Descensus is mentioned, as also in his Hymn to Christ

---

[1]) Vid. Teuffel, Geschichte der römischen Literatur, § 436. Ebert, Geschichte der Christlich-Lateinischen Literatur von ihren Anfängen bis zum Zeitalter Karls des Grossen. Leipzig, 1874. I, p. 243 ff.

[2]) See Commentary to v. 1.

[3]) Migne, Patrologia Latina vol. 19. For the authorship of the poem see Teuffel § 436, 7 and Ebert I, p. 120 ff.

[4]) Vid. Ebert I, p. 358 ff. 'Der Beiname Caelius hat keine genügende handschriftliche Gewähr': Teuffel § 473, 1.

[5]) Migne 19, col. 751; cf. the corresponding passage in the prose version 'Opus Paschale'.

v. 86 ff. (col. 769). The passages in the three last mentioned authors are short, and not to be compared with the accounts in Epiphanius and Eusebius.

Coming nearer home we find that this story was by no means unknown to the Latin writers of Great Britain. Mention has already been made of the fact that Venerable Bede mentions it as a part of the Christian faith. It is also a matter of some interest to find the subject alluded to by Aldhelm, whose Riddles were extensively used by Cynewulf as the foundation of his own. In his poem 'De laudibus Virginum'[1]) occur the following lines (col. 246):

Sic tamen optatam senserunt saecla salutem
Dum Deus ad vagas Erebi descenderet umbras,
Ferrea vectiferae fracturus limina valvae,
Ærea portarum quassavit claustra tetrarum;
Ut Psalmista prius praesaga voce canebat,
Passurum mundi promens in calce Tonantem.

To assume that Aldhelm knew the Ev. Nic. is unnecessary, though even this meagre notice could hardly have sprung from the Biblical account. Likely enough Aldhelm had seen numerous versions of the story in the ecclesiastical writings of his day. This poem of Aldhelm's was very probably known to the author of H., though it is altogether inconceivable that the mere mention of the Descensus there made should have moved him to the composition of an extensive and circumstantial poem.

Somwhat later, possibly later too than the date of the composition of the Anglo-Saxon poem, we find among the writings of Joannes Scotus Erigena[2]) several poems on the same subject. In the first collection with the heading, 'Joannis Scoti Versus, Sectio I', we find a poem (no. V) entitled, 'De Christi Resurrectione', another (no. VI), 'Christi descensus ad inferos et resurrectio'. This latter poem is tolerably short, yet the version appears in the main faithful to the Ev. Nic.: compare the following lines.

15 Sed victor mundi praestantior omnibus unus
Totum collisit comminuitque caput.

[1]) Migne 89, col. 237—280.
[2]) Migne 122, col. 1228 ff.; Ebert II, p. 258 ff.

20 Laetantur miseri, quos laesit dira potestas,
Captivi redeunt, vincula laxa vacant.

These quotations might easily be continued, but enough has been given to show how thoroughly the story of Christ's descent to Hades pervaded not only the strictly theological, but also the literary writings of the early Christians. Yet after all we come back with renewed confidence to the opinion expressed before, that the author of H. was acquainted with the Ev. Nic., for nowhere else do we find a version that shows as much agreement with our poem as does this gospel.

§ 3. Cynewulf's Treatment of his Sources.

An examination of the manner in which C. has used his sources by Fritzsche resulted in the establishment of a set of laws which have since then been accepted as correct, and which were applied by Lefèvre to Gu. Judged by these rules H. could not be assigned to C. since we find here not so much a following of any one authority as a free use of several originals. A close examination of CW., however, reveals the fact that this is just the way in which R. and Cri., usually accepted as the earlier works of C., have been built up from their sources. Fritzsche's canons have been based, not on a study of all the works of C., but only of El. and Jul. This is apparent from a most superficial reading of the part of the article in question. The illustrations are taken almost without exception from these two poems. The only exceptions are under no. 4, where the writer quotes R. 41 on Dietrich's authority, and under no. 6, where, mentioning the introduction of passages to which the sources afforded no occasion, he adds, by way of example, the Runes in Jul. and Cri., and the first Riddle. As, therefore, these canons were formulated after a study of El. and Jul., so it is impossible to apply them either to the Riddles or to Crist. Fritzsche is himself aware of the difficulty in his way, and seeks to escape from the dilemma by the supposition that some detailed Latin work was used by C. as the basis of Cri.; a supposition that is rendered less likely by the fact that for a considerable portion of the work the sources have been found. Thorpe, while still supposing the elements of Cri. to be sepa-

rate and independent poems, expressed the opinion that they were free translations from Latin originals.[1]) This supposition may be true or it may not, but, at any rate, we can build no argument on the theory until the original is found. Contenting ourselves then with the materials at hand and the facts of the case as we have them, we shall proceed to substantiate the view expressed by an examination of the relation of R. and Cri. to their respective sources.

Crist.

The examination of the sources of Cri. was made by Dietrich in the same article in which be proved the existence of the poem, that is, that the series of hymns printed by Thorpe p. 1—103 form one connected whole. The poem falls into three divisions, of which the first treats of the coming of Christ to earth, the second of his ascension, or second coming as C. calls it, and the third of his return to judge the world.

I. (1—440).

For the first division Dietrich regards Matth. 1, 18—23 as the basis, though the account given there is treated with much freedom. He says, 'Zum grunde liegt diesem rest des gedichts epische behandlung von Matth. 1, 18—23, was nach dem gedächtniss mit übergehung des traumes Joseph's ausgeführt und durch viele auf das kommen Christi beztigliche bibelstellen beleuchtet wird'.[2]) The following are these Biblical references: v. 1—3 = Matth. 21, 42; v. 3—8 = Eph. 4, 15—16 and Eph. 2, 20—22; v. 9—15 = Acts 15, 16; v. 25—30 = Luke 1, 79; v. 104 ff. = John 1, 1—5 and John 1, 14; v. 238—243 = Prov. 8, 22—31; v. 251 ff. = Ezek. 44, 2; v. 304—325 = Ezek. 44, 1—3; v. 403 ff. = Isa. 6, 3; Luke 2, 14; Matth. 21, 9.

II. (440—779).

The second division is the only one the sources of which have been satisfactorily established. Cynewulf certainly had

---

[1]) Cod. Ex. Preface V and VI.

[2]) More probable is the supposition that some Latin homily formed the basis of this part, as is the case with part II.

before him the 29th homily of Gregory the Great, as D. indicated in his article, though he has not bound himself slavishly to the Latin. From v. 440—458 we find a poetic version of the following passage from Gregory, § 9: Hoc autem nobis primum quaerendum est, quidnam sit, quod nato Domino apparuerunt Angeli, et tamen non leguntur in albis vestibus apparuisse: ascendente autem Domino missi Angeli in albis leguntur vestibus apparuisse.

The passage 459—543 gives the narrative of the ascension, taken from the Bible yet treated with much freedom. Nearer references may be given as follows: 456—462 = Luke 24, 50; 462—470 = Acts 1, 3; 475—480 = John 16, 22; 480—490 = Matth. 28, 18—20; 490—505, a vivid narrative not strictly scriptural; 505—527 = Acts 1, 11; 531 and 32 = Mark. 16, 19; 532—535 = Acts 1, 12.

544—558 comes back to Gregory and answers the question previously propounded, but not as plainly as it is answered in the Latin.

558—600, not in Gregory nor taken from the Bible.

600—779, a hymn of praise and thanksgiving based on Gregory, § 10 and 11. Until v. 759 the Latin is followed pretty closely and often traces of verbal translation appear. The scriptural references given by D. for this part are derived from Gregory and not taken at first hand from the Bible. Of course there are some features peculiar to Cynewulf. His list of gifts 664—685 is given according to his own taste, and in the enumeration of the various 'leaps' or stages in Christ's history, the fifth one, 730—736, telling of the descent to Hades, is altogether absent in the Latin, — a fact which strengthens the assertion previously made, that this incident had entered quite deeply into the mind of Cynewulf.

III. (779—1694).

The closing portion of the 29th homily of Gregory alludes to Christ's second coming and may have suggested to C. the writing of the latter part of Cri. As regards the sources D. says; 'Vom dritten habe ich nur den inhalt einer stelle des vierten gesanges aufgefunden in der zehnten homilie Gregors, wonach die vermuthung Thorpes wegfällt, die betrachtung sei

erst aus Aelfr. Hom. I, 622 entlehnt; beide schöpften hier wie sonst unabhängig aus derselben quelle'. The passage here alluded to is 1128—1189. A few passages seem taken directly from the Bible; thus 868 ff. from Matth. 24, 43, 1 Thess. 5, 2; 1345 ff. from Matth. 25, 34—36, and 1520 ff. from Matth. 25, 41. Whether other scriptural allusions as 930 ff. and 1222 ff. have been taken from the Bible, or whether they have been gathered along with other matter out of some homily or religious treatise is impossible to say. In several passages the detail of circumstance is carried out in a way different from the Bible. Thus, when Christ addresses the condemned 1380 ff., he recounts the fall of man and his own sufferings and death and not till 1520 does he pass the final sentence, — the only fact that agrees with the Bible.

That Cynewulf has, in the composition of Cri., drawn not so much on any one work, as upon a number of sources in connection with material stored away in his memory seems quite clear. To conceive of his turning with premeditation to Matth. to translate three lines, and then immediately to Eph., and then to Amos is impossible. The facts of the case as they stand can only be explained on the supposition that the plan of the poem is Cynewulf's own, and that he proceeded to the end proposed by his own route, not hesitating however to use the ideas of others as he had met them whenever occasion offered. One positive confirmation (noticed previously by D.) of the assumption that many of the Biblical quotations are from memory is found in the fact that a passage is attributed to Isaiah that really occurs in Ezekiel: cf. v. 303 ff. with Ezekiel 44, 1—3. That C. may have gotten many suggestions for his work from the religious literature of his time is quite likely. Hymns in praise of the Virgin Mary, or descriptive of the Ascension or the terrors of the final judgement, were by no means infrequent. The same Epiphanius mentioned above has an oration entitled, 'Sancti Epiphanii Episcopi Constantiae Cypri de Domini nostri Jesu Christi Assumptione Oratio'. Gregory's works afford dozens of passages bearing on the same themes, and we have also the fragment of a poem by Aldhelm treating of the final judgement. The poem is entitled 'De Die Judicii' and is printed Migne 89,

col. 297 ff. It is a matter of regret that this work is only preserved to us in the shape of a corrupt fragment, as there are several passages that suggest relationship to Crist. Thus v. 1—17 show some similarity with Cri. 885 ff. and 1028 ff., v. 18—23 with Cri. 934 ff., v. 28—47 with Cri. 925 ff. and 1008 ff., v. 64 ff. with Cri. 1217 ff. and the last four lines of the poem with Cri. 1164 ff.

The question whether we are justified in assuming an acquaintance with the Ev. Nic. on Cynewulf's part at the time when Cri. was written is hard to answer positively, yet there are a few things that may be said. And first, although we must admit the fact that the passages in Cri. betray no positive use of the Ev. Nic., yet we are not on that account justified in affirming that such an acquaintance on the part of C. was impossible. His knowledge of the subject may have been as full and complete when he wrote the passage R. 56_6 or Cri. 143 ff., as it was when he composed the longer part Cri. 558 ff.; certainly we cannot suppose that his knowledge was less complete when he dismissed the whole subject with the merest allusion, as he afterwards did repeatedly, viz. Cri. 730 ff. 1160, Gu. 1074, El. 181. On each occasion C. seems to have followed his own taste and to have gone into detail only so far as the peculiar circumstances of each case admitted or demanded. At a previous place (p. 9) an attempt was made to show that this part of Cri., namely 558—571, is highly appropriate in the connection in which it stands. We may even dare to go further than this, and assert that anything more than C. has given, that anything like an epic description of Christ's descent would have been out of place. The passage is preeminently lyrical; the nature of the strain demanded that the great results of Christ's life and death should be sung, but not described after the manner of a chronicle. Though the account then in Cri. betrays no positive use of the Ev. Nic., yet we search in vain for contradictions or discrepances between the two versions. The simple facts of the case as mentioned in Cri. are fully in accord with the Ev. Nic. group A. Such an expression as *'wǣpna wyrpum'*, Cri. 565, is but a slight instance of poetic license and is not proof that C. had some original before him in which this fact was mentioned. The

statement that Christ drew forth (*âhlôd,* v. 568) the redeemed from the foe's city does not conflict with A cap. 9, where he delivers them to Michael to be escorted into Paradise. 'Qui facit per alium, facit per se.' The fact that Christ himself is represented as leading them (v. 574) cannot be cited in this connection, for here it is the ascension that is being described and not the descent to Hades. We can only say then that while a positive use of the Ev. Nic. cannot be proven from Cri., yet we have no reason to conclude the contrary.

Riddles.

The sources of the Riddles have already been investigated with care by Dietrich, Ebert, and Prehn in the following treatises.

Dietrich, 'Die Rätsel des Exeterbuchs', in Haupt's Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, XI and XII.

Ebert, 'Die Rätselpoesie der Angelsachsen'. Berichte der k. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1877.

Prehn, 'Komposition und Quellen der Rätsel des Exeterbuchs'. Körting's Neuphilologische Studien, Heft III. Paderborn, 1883.

The editions of the Latin authors that have been used are as follows.

Symphosius; Anthologia Latina, sive Poesis Latinae Supplementum, rec. Al. Riese, Lipsiae, 1869. I, p. 187—207.

Aldhelm; Migne's Patrologia Latina 89.

Tatwine and Eusebius in the article of Ebert before mentioned.

In treating the Riddles in relation to their sources it will be necessary to make several divisions or classes.

1. In the first class we may place those that are undoubtedly translations from the Latin. Here belongs first of all R. 41 The Creation, translated with considerable faithfulness from Ald. XIV de creatura; then R. 36 Coat of Mail, from Ald. IV 3 de lorica. In R. 27 Book, C. has made use of many and varied sources: Ald. V, 9 de pugillaribus, V, 3 de penna scriptoria, Eus. 31 de cera, 35 de penna, Tatw. 5 de membrano, 6 de penna, and an Aenig. Cod. Bernen.[1]) de membrana, all

[1]) Printed in Riese's Anthol. Lat. I, p. 300.

show similarity with one another and with the A. S. riddle. The most literal translation appears v. 1.

Mec fêonda sum feore besnyðede,
woruldstrenga binom, wæ̂tte siððan,

Therewith cf. Tatw. v. 1.

Efferus exuviis populator me spoliavit,
Vitalis pariter flatus spiramina demsit.

One other riddle may be reckoned to this class, although the three lines of the Latin are doubled in the A.-S. version. The one meant is no. 48 A Moth, translated from Symp. 16 tinea, not however literally. In regard to the composition of these riddles there is but one theory possible, and that is, that Cynewulf had the Latin text before his eyes and has given an intentional translation thereof.

2. A second class is formed by those riddles whose main idea seems to have been derived from the Latin, but in the development of that idea the poet has pursued an independent path. For this class it is sufficient to assume that he had read or heard the Latin, and in no case does it seem that he has with deliberation attempted to translate what others had written before. We may here make two subdivisions of closer or less close agreement. To the former (a), we may reckon those riddles that show some trace of the Latin in the language. Sometimes this similarity is confined to a single expression, sometimes it runs through several; but in all cases the bulk of the poem is independent, and in its essential whole is C.'s own work. The second subdivision (b) is characterized by the lack of verbal similarity; the agreement is only in idea and that only partially. The following is the enumeration of the riddles that belong here.

2 a.

R. 2 Storm on Land, Ald. I, 2 de vento; cf. the following resemblances.

v. 4. þragum wræ̂ce
fêre geond foldan,
v. 2. Argutum vocis crepitum cito pando per orbem,
v. 7. Hlin bið on eorðan,
wælcwealm wera, þonne ic wudu hrêre,
bearwas blêdhwate, bêamas fylle

holme gehrêfed, hêahum meahtum
wrecan on wâðe wîde sended,
v. 3. Viribus horrisonis valeo confringere quercus;
Nam superos ego pulso polos, et rura peragro.

In addition to Ald. I, 2 may not C have seen Eus. 8, de vento et igne?

R. 13 Hide, Ald. III, 11 de bove, sive de juvenco; cf. also Symp. 56 caliga, and Eus. 37 de vitulo.

v. 1. Fôtum ic fêre, foldan slîte,
grêne wongas, þenden ic gæst bere.
Gif me feorh losað, fæste binde
swearte Wealas, hwîlum sêllan men.

Ald. v. 3. Vivens nam terrae glebas cum stirpibus imis
Nisu virtutis validae disrumpo feraces:
At vero linquit dum spiritus algida membra,
Nexibus horrendis homines constringere possum.

The rest of the poem is C.'s own; closely connected with the opening lines of this riddle is no. 39, soon to follow.

R. 17 Anchor, Symp. 61 ancora.

v. 1. Oft ic sceal wið wæge winnan and wið winde feohtan,

Symp. v. 2. Cum vento luctor, cum gurgite pugno profundo.

R. 39 Steer, Eus. 37 de vitulo, Ald. III, 11 de juvenco, V, 8 de ariete.[1]) The nearest resemblance is that found between the last three lines and a passage from Eus.

v. 5. Mon maðelade, se þe me gesægde,
sêo wiht gif hîo gedŷgeð, dûna briceð;
gif he tôbirsteð, bindeð cwice.

Eus. v. 3. 1. — et si vixero, rumpere colles
Incipiam, viros moriens aut alligo multos.

R. 61 Reedflute, Symp. 2 harundo.

v. 1. Ic wæs be sande sæwealle nêah
æt merefaroðe.

Symp. v. 1. Dulcis amica dei, ripae vicina profundae,

The thought in v. 10 ff. seems to be developed out of Symp. v. 3.

Nuntia sum linguae digitis signata magistri.

R. 66 Onion, Symp. 44 cepa.

v. 5. Monnan ic ne bîte, nymðe he me bîte;
sindan þâra monige, þe mec bîtad.

Symp. v. 1. Mordeo mordentes, ultro non mordeo quemquam
Sed sunt mordentem multi mordere parati.

R. 73 Cuttle-fish, Ald. I, 18 de loligine.

v. 3. flêah mid fuglum and on flôde swom,
dêaf under ŷðe dêad mid fiscum etc.

---

[1]) Cf. further Lorscher Rätsel no. 11 in Haupt XXII (Neue Folge X), p. 261, and Ebert, 'Zu den Lorscher Rätseln', Haupt XXIII (N. F. XI), p. 200—203.

Ald. v. 2. Cum volucrum turma quoque scando per aethera pennis.
Cum grege piscoso scrutor maris aequora squamis.

2 b.

R. 3 Storm at Sea. The composition of no. 2 naturally suggests nos. 3 and 4, though these are not dependent directly on the Latin for any of their ideas, unless it be that R. 3_{14} is taken from Eus. 21 de terra et mari, v. 3.

Cum pax perficitur subter vel pugna quiescit.

R. 5 Millstone. Prehn interprets the þegn alluded to v. 1 as the servant who turns the mill, while Dietrich following the Latin regarded it as the second one of a pair of millstones. Outside of the general idea of the riddle, the only trace of the Latin is in the word þragbysig v. 1, which reminds one of Ald. IV, 12 de mola, v. 4 altera nam currit, or of Symp. 51 mola, v. 3 non desinit ille moveri; but how could Cynewulf have taken the subject of a millstone without alluding to its motion?

R. 6 Shield, Ald. III, 13 clypeus. A few ideas necessarily connected with the subject are common to the A.-S. and Latin, but C. has taken decidedly his own way in the main.

R. 7 The Sun, Ald. VIII, 3 de sole et luna, Eus. 10 de sole. The only trace of the Latin is in v. 1

mec gesette sôð sigora waldend
Crist tô compe,

Ald. v. 5. Sed potius summi genuit regnator Olympi.

R. 12 Night; indebted in general to Ald. XIII de nocte; cf. also Eus. 48 de die et nocte.

R. 21 Sword, Ald. IV, 10 de pugione vel spatica.

v. 8. Oft ic gæstberend
cwelle compwæpnum.

Ald. v. 6. Per me multorum clauduntur lumina letho,
Qui domini nudus nitor defendere vitam.

R. 24 Bow. There are several Latin riddles from which it may have been suggested; as, Symp. 65 sagitta, Tatw. 32 de sagitta, 34 de pharetra.

R. 28 Mead; so interpreted by Lange.[1])

Ald. II, 3 de ape, VI, 9 de calice vitreo.

The nearest agreement is found between v. 8 and Ald. VI, 9 v. 9.

R. 29 Winekeg, Ald. VII, 2 de cuppa vinaria.

R. 30 Sun and Moon, Ald. I, 6 de luna, VIII, 3 de sole et luna, Eus. 11 de luna. Aenigm. Cod. Bern., de luna.[2])

R. 37 Sow with Pigs. Ald. VI, 10 de scrofa praegnante, Ald. I, 10 de puerpera geminos enixa, Symp. 92 mulier quae geminos pariebat.

R. 38 Bellows, Symp. 73 Uter, Ald. I, 13 de poliadis, id est follibus fabrorum.

R. 54 Battering Ram, Ald. V, 8 de ariete.

---

[1]) Haupt XII, p. 239.

[2]) Riese's Anthol. Lat. I, p. 303.

R. 64 Goblet, Ald. VI, 9 de calice vitreo. The following similarity is noticeable.

v. 4. Hwîlum mec on côfan cysseð mûðe
tillîc esne, þǽr wit tu bêoð
fæðme [beclyppeð fin]grum þŷð.

Ald. v. 5. Nempe volunt plures collum confringere dextra
Et pulchre digitis lubricum comprendere corpus
Sed mentes muto dum labris oscula trado.

R. 80 Precious Ore, Symp. 91 pecunia.

R. 82 Fish in a Stream, Symp. 11 flumen et piscis, Eus. 40 de pisce. The opening lines of the A.-S. riddle show some resemblance to Symp.

v. 1. Nis mîn sele swîge ne ic sylfa hlûd
ymb .....; unc dryhten scôp
sîð ætsomne. Ic eom swiftre þonne he,

Symp. v. 2. Ipsa domus resonat, tacitus sed non sonat hospes
Ambo tamen currunt, hospes simul et domus una.

R. 85 Horn, Eus. 30 de atramentorio.

3. To the third and last class belong those riddles that show a minimum use of the Latin. Many of them are, as far as we can judge, perfectly original productions, while for the others the indebtedness of the A.-S. poet is seen nowhere except in the selection of his subject.[1]) Here belong all those riddles not already discussed, but for the sake of completeness an especial list is given, with reference occasionally to some Latin riddle treating of the same or some similar subject.

R. 1 and 89 The poet himself[2]); probably suggested by Ald. Prologus and Symp. Praefatio.

R. 4 Hurricane, cf. R. 2 and 3. Prehn's characterisation of v. 67—72 as 'der von Ald. entlehnte Kern der Dichtung' is hypercritical.

R. 8 Swan.

R. 9 Singing Bird; Prehn interprets it as 'Holztaube', Dietrich as 'Pfeife'. Perhaps suggested by Ald. II, 5 de luscinia.

R. 10 Cuckoo, Symp. 14 pullus in ovo.

R. 11 Wake of a Boat. Perhaps suggested by Symp. 13 navis, v. 3 vestigia nulla relinquens.

R. 14 The solution is not easy. Wright[3]) suggested a butterfly in

---

[1]) It has been a matter of some difficulty in certain cases to decide whether a riddle belongs under 2b or here.

[2]) From this interpretation it will be seen that I am unable to agree with Trautmann, who in an article recently published (Anglia VI, Anzeiger p. 158—169) gives 'the riddle' as the solution of both of these riddles and thinks C.'s authorship for the whole collection is still unproved.

[3]) Biographia Brittanica Literaria, Anglo-Saxon Period. London, 1842, p. 80.

the different stages of its existence; Grein[1]) suggested a kind of caterpillar; Dietrich attempted to refer it to the 22 letters of the alphabet and compares Ald. IV, 1 to which Ebert adds Tatw. 4, Eus. 7, and Aenigm. Cod. Bern., de litteris.[2]) Prehn agrees with Dietrich and thinks C. has made the solution of the riddle very easy. Grein's view, which he afterwards defended Germania X, p. 308[3]), seems on the whole preferable.

R. 15 Horn of a Steer, Eus. 30 de atramentorio; cf. R. 85 and 88.

R. 16 Badger, Symp. 21 talpa.

R. 18 Ballista, Ald. VI, 8 de fundibulo.

R. 19 Leather Bag.

R. 20 Hunter.

R. 22 Plow.

R. 23 Month.

R. 25 Jackdaw.

R. 26 Hemp.

R. 31 Rainwater, Symp. 9 pluvia, Ald. I, 3 de nube.

R. 32 Bagpipe.

R. 33 Ship, Symp. 13 navis.

R. 34 Piece of Ice, Symp. 10 glacies, Tatw. 15 de nive, grandine et glacie.

R. 35 Rake, Symp. 60 serra.

R. 40 Day.

R. 42 The Earth, Ald. I, 1 de terra, Eus. 6 de terra.

R. 43 Cock and Hen, Ald. II, 19 de gallinaceo.

R. 44 Body and Soul, Eus. 25 de animo.

R. 45, 46, 55, and 63 are of doubtful meaning; very probably C. has been intentionally ambiguous.

R. 47 Lot and his Daughters.

R. 49 Some Church Utensil. — Pyx? Ald. VI, 4 de crismale sive crismaro, Tatw. 12 de patena.

R. 50 Bookcase, Ald. II, 14 de arca libraria.

R. 51 Dog.

R. 52 Dragon, Eus. 42 de dracone, Beowulf 2302—2315 and 2355 ff.

R. 53 Two Wellbuckets.

R. 56 Shield.

R. 57 Loom, Ald. IV, 3 de lorica, IV, 7 de fusis, Symp. 17 aranea.

R. 58 Gnats or Swallows? Ald. IV, 6 de cinyphe, VI, 1 de hirundine.

R. 59 Well, Symp. 71 puteus and 72 tubus.

R. 60 Sacramental Goblet, cf. R. 49.

R. 62 Shirt.

---

[1]) Bib. II, p. 410.

[2]) Riese's Anthol. Lat. p. 300.

[3]) Prehn does not seem to have seen this article of Grein's, as he makes no allusion to it here nor under R. 53 and 65, which were also discussed by Grein. His own criticism (p. 278 and 79) of Dietrich's explanation of R. 53 had been already anticipated by Grein.

R. 65 Peacock?[1])
R. 67 The Creation, Ald. XIV, cf. R. 41.
R. 68 Piece of Ice, cf. R. 34.
R. 69 A Reed Pipe, cf. R. 61.
R. 70 Cupping Glass, Ald. IV, 8 de cucuma.
R. 71 Axletree, Symp. 77 rotae.
R. 72 Lance.
R. 74 Dog.
R. 75 and 77 consist of only one line each and are possibly only parts of some other riddle.
R. 76 Oyster, Ald. I, 19 de perna, III, 2 de cancro qui nepa vocatur.
R. 78 Falcon.
R. 79 Ship (Dietrich), Visor (Lange).
R. 81 Water, Ald. III, 1 de aqua, IV, 14 de fonte, Eus. 23 de equore.
R. 83 One-eyed Peddler, Symp. 94 luscus alium tenens.
R. 84 Keg.
R. 86 Lupus[2]), a pun on the poet's name.
R. 87 Key, Symp. 4 clavis.
R. 88 Horn, cf. R. 15 and 85.

Summing up the foregoing, we find class 1 represented by 4, 2a by 7, 2b by 17, and class 3 by 61 riddles. Only, therefore, in the case of 11 (cl. 1 and 2a) are we justified in speaking of a translation, even a partial one, from the Latin. The others are in the main original works of Cynewulf, original, not in the subjects selected, but in the manner of treating them.[3]) Gathering here an idea, there an idea, here a subject, there an application thereof, he has passed it all through a refining and unifying process and presents it to us a new creation, showing, it is true, from its very material a borrowed origin, yet bearing upon its face a stamp of originality, an impress that is not a counterfeit. We must not picture the poet sitting in his study surrounded by massive parchments of Eusebius, Aldhelm, and Symphosius, from whose dusty pages he selects

---

[1]) Vid. Grein in Germania X, p. 309.

[2]) 'Trotz eifrigen Nachdenkens ist es mir nicht gelungen, irgend eine beziehung zu Cynewulf's person oder namen in diesem rätsel zu entdecken. Ich glaube wir dürfen die vier lupos des sechsundachtzigsten rätsels getrost zu den vier wulfum des ersten legen'; Trautmann in Anglia VI, Anzeiger p. 160.

[3]) This is probably what Prehn means when he says p. 154 — 'so möchten wir uns unbeanstandet der Vermutung hingeben, dass wir ein durchaus originelles Werk des seiner Zeit so berühmten Cynewulf vor uns haben'.

thought after thought and combines them into a piece of literary mosaic, but we are rather to think of a man, who, if not a scholar, was at least not unacquainted with the literature of his day, and who had probably heard from his school-days those riddles of the Latin authors and perhaps many others in his own tongue. When we remember to what extent this species of literature was cultivated among the Anglo-Saxons; how riddles were employed for entertainment in company or as means of instruction for the young[1]), we shall cease to be surprised that the same object should give occasion for so many different versions, or that an author, in a riddle mainly his own, should occasionally adopt some feature already made use of by his predecessors.

As the result then of this examination of the sources of R. and Cri., we come back with renewed emphasis to the position taken in the beginning; that the relation of R. and Cri. to their respective sources cannot be indicated by canons made for El. and Jul., and that they show not so much a following of any one authority as wide reading and the use of many authors, which seems to be the way in which H. has been built up from its sources.

§ 4. Style of the Poem.

But little can be gathered for C.'s authorship out of the style, yet nothing can be adduced that argues against it. The same rhetorical figures or other peculiarities of poetical diction as are frequent in CW. may also be found in H., but as they are, for the most part, the common possession of all the A.-S. poets but little proof is thereby gained for C. There is one feature however that seems to betray the hand of C., and that is the employment of the Apostrophe. This figure does not occur at all in Beowulf, An., nor in the more truly epic poems of C. (El. and Jul.). Apostrophes to the Deity, hardly more than a prayer, are found in abundance in Hy. as also in Met. IV and XX. Cri. shows a number of this character, viz. 1—20, 104 ff. 130 ff. 214 ff. 348 ff. 377 ff. A step further removed are the two passages Gen. 725 ff. and Sat. 164 ff., since here it is a fallen angel

[1]) For proof of this assertion see Ebert's article, p. 20 and 21.

that is speaking and it is not a prayer that is uttered. Four fully developed Apostrophes meet us in H.; to Gabriel v. 76, to Mary v. 84, to Jerusalem v. 99, and to Jordan v. 103. These cannot but remind us vividly of the two strikingly similar ones in Cri., viz. 50—70 to Jerusalem, and 275 ff. to Mary. The only similar instance I have been able to find outside of CW. is the address of Nebuchadnezzar to Babylon, Dan. 609.[1])

The use of *hû* introducing these exclamations is also quite peculiar to C. Outside of Cri., where it occurs five times, there are only three examples of this use in A.-S. poetry.[2]) Another characteristic of C. is the use of *hâlsian* in address, which is found twice in H. and four times in CW. If it were used in like proportion by other poets, we should have some 16 examples elsewhere, since CW. form only about one fifth of the A.-S. poetical literature. As a fact we find it only three times elsewhere in the poets; viz. Sat. 422, Hy. 3_{47}, B. 2132. Although then it is not claimed that this expression was to others unknown (it occurs several times in prose), yet it seems to have been especially favored by C. For opportunity of reference and for the sake of completeness we will notice several other points of style that H. has in common not only with CW. but with the most of the other monuments of A.-S. poetry. The proof hereby afforded for C.'s authorship is purely negative.

a) Dietrich[3]) remarked the love with which C. repeats phrases and often whole lines. The repetition seems to have been occasioned mainly by the suggestive power of alliteration. In the comparatively short fragment before us we find quite a number of such specimens; thus,

29 and 41 ealles folces fruma,
79 þâ þu þone cnyht tô us
brôhtest in Bethlem,
85 þâ þu þæt cild tô us
brôhtest in Bethlem.
99 Ea lâ Hierusalem in Judêum,

---

[1]) Taken together with the two examples cited above from Gen. and Sat. from Ziegler: Der poetische Sprachgebrauch in den sogen. Cædmonschen Dichtungen. Münster 1883.

[2]) The references are: Cri. 130. 216. 278. 362. 1460, An. 63, Wand. 95, Met. 3.

[3]) Commentatio de Kynewulfi etc. p. 12.

128 and [fore] Hierusalem in Judêum,
103 Ea lâ Jordane in Judêum,
131 and for Jordane in Judêum.
107 Nu ic þe hâlsie hǣlend ûser,
118 Swylce ic þe hâlsige, hǣlend ûser.
25 môdig tô þǣre mengo ymb his mǣges [sîð] [1])
57 môdig fore þǣre mengo and tô his mǣge spræc.
61 Nu we on þissum bendum bid[on longe],
80 Bidan we þæs longe,
88 bîdan in bendum
100 and 104 hû þu in þǣre stôwe stille gewunadest.

b) Another kind of repetition is the frequent employment of the same word or expression in the beginning of a number of consecutive clauses or phrases. Our poem affords one striking example;

118 Swilce ic þe hâlsige, hǣlend ûser,
fore þînum cildhâde, cyninga sêlast,
and fore þǣre wunde, weoruda dr[yhten],
[and fore] þînum ǣriste, æðelinga wyn,
and fore þinre me[aglan mǣr]an nâma;
The same beginning is also found v. 124? 128. 131.[2])

c) Another peculiarity of style quite common in CW. as elsewhere is the heaping up of different expressions to denote the same idea. In its milder form it may be called Cumulation, from which the transition is quite easy to Tautology. H. shows the following specimens.[3])

1. Repetition of subject.

17 ac þǣr cwom on uhtan ân engla þrêat,
behæfde hêapa wyn hǣlendes burg.
21 hagostealdonwôc
môdig from moldan, mægenþrym ârâs.
31 [þætte us] to dæge dryhten wille
[sylfa] gesêcan, sigebearn godes,
33 Fŷsde hine þâ tô fôre frêa moncynnes;
wolde heofona helm helle wealles
forbrecan and forbŷgan, þǣre burge þrym
onginnan rêafian, rêðust ealra cyninga.

---

[1]) 'Mæges: hiernach sind 3 Buchstaben überklebt; sollte *sîð* zu ergänzen sein?' Schipper in Germania XIX, p. 334.

[2]) For numerous examples from CW. see Jansen, Beiträge zur Synonymik und Poetik der allgemein als echt anerkannten Dichtungen Cynewulfs. Münster 1883. § 10, 2 p. 95 ff.

[3]) For numerous instances in CW. see Jansen, p. 60—67 and 81—83.

40 cyning in ôðrâd,
ealles folces fruma forð onette,
weoruda wuldorgiefa.
101 nc môstan þe geondfêran foldbûende
ealle lifgende.
115 þu meaht ymbfôn eal folca gesetu,
swylce þu meaht gerîman, rîce dryhten,
sæs sandgrotu, sêlast ealra cyninga!
Swylce ic þe hâlsige, hælend ûser,
fore þînum cildhâde, cyninga sêlast,
and fore þære wunde, weoruda dr[yhten],
[and fore] þînum æriste, æðelinga wyn etc.

2. Repetition of attribute.

76 hû þu eart glêaw and scearp,
milde and gemyndig and monþwære.

3. Repetition of verb.

21 hagostealdonwôc
môdig from moldan, mægenþrym ârâs.
30 wêne ic ful swîðe and witod [talige].
34 wolde heofona helm helle weallas
forbrecan and forbŷgan.
23 Sægde Johannis
hæleð helwarum, hlyhhende spræc.
40 cyning in ôðrâd
ealles folces fruma forð onette.
57 tô his mæge spræc
and þâ wilcuman wordum grêtte.

d) In regard to the general structure of the sentences in H. and the manner in which they are joined together, there is no variation from Cynewulf's usage. The majority of sentences in H., as elsewhere in A.-S. poetry, have no connective at all. In the first part of the poem where the facts of Christ's death and resurrection are hurried over in 30 lines, it is especially appropriate that the sentences should be short, concise, and disconnected; and so we find them. Altogether there are in H. 73 principal sentences. Of this number 56 have no connective at all; 17 are introduced by *and, ac, þâ, hû, hûru, swylce, ne, swâ.* Fritzsche noticed in Andreas an especially frequent employment of *þâ* as a connective, — altogether about 150 times; that is, some 8 times in every 100 lines. H. has this use only 3 times and thus stands more nearly on the plane of C.'s genuine works. No special peculiarity such as

the frequent use of *ac* and *hwæðre*[1]) in Kr. marks our poem, unless it be the employment of *hû* in exlamations, and this speaks rather for C. than against him.

§ 5. Vocabulary and Grammatical Examination.

We now proceed to an examination of H. from a philological stand point. And first of all, let us notice the vocabulary employed, and see how it agrees with the usage of Cynewulf. In this examination we must start from the facts at hand; to heap up words or expressions common in CW., but lacking in H., would prove nothing, owing to the fragmentary condition of our poem.

The vocabulary of H. consists of 344 words. The main difference between the vocabulary of H. and that of CW. will be found in the compounds. Out of more than 100 simple nouns, there are only two that are unknown to CW., and both of these occur in passages where the reading is doubtful; viz. *nama* 122 and *monað* 28 (Ms. monat). In the list of verbs all the new ones belong to the compounds. The prefixes employed are *â-, æl-, bi-, be-, for-, ge-, ôð-, on-, ofer-, ymb-,* all of which are common enough in CW. The following is a list of the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,* or words not occuring elsewhere in A.-S. poetry[2]):

1. Compounds: bimǽnan 4, berêotan 6, ôðrîdan 40, geondflôwan 105, æðelcund 1, eorðærn 3. 12. 19, êasterniht 15, nîðloc[an] 64, bealuclom 65, heorusceorp 73, helledor 87, gedyrst 108, sandgrot 117.

2. Simple nouns: rêon 6, nâma 122.

Besides these *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,* H. shows a number of words which, though occurring elsewhere in A.-S. poetry, yet are not found in CW. These are as follows:

1. Compounds: âcolian 6, behabban 18, onwacan 21, oflyst 81, geondfêran 101, gerîman 116, gemiltsian 109, ymbstondan 124, ymbfôn 115, oferweorpan 133, wîfman 16. 48, helmberend 37, burggeat 38, burgwaran 56. 134, cyneþrym 51. 74, eftcyme 130, monþwǽre 77, dægrêd 9, hagosteald 21.

2. Simple words: monað 28, ênd 71.

---

[1]) Cf. Ebert's article in the 'Berichten der k. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Phil.-Histor. Klasse'. 1884. p. 91.

[2]) I am aware that this is not a strictly correct definition of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,* but it is about the only one admissible in the present state of A.-S. lexicography.

A discussion of all these words will follow; before that, however, it may be instructive to make a comparison between the 137 lines of H. and the same number taken from the beginning of El. and of Jul. The vocabulary of El. 1—137 consists of 396 words, in which the proportion of nouns, verbs etc. is very much the same as in H. Jul. 1—137 shows in general like ratio, with a vocabulary of 391 words. When we notice, however, the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα and words not used elsewhere by C., we find a much large proportion of each than in H. The following tables show the facts of the case more clearly.

I. ἅπαξ λεγόμενα.

	cn.[1])	sn.	cv.	sv.	adj.	adv.		total.
El.	15	2	1	2	5	1	=	26
Jul.	12	2	2	2	7	2	=	27
H.	8	2	4	0	1	0	=	15

II. Words not used elsewhere by C.

	cn.	sn.	cv.	sv.	adj.	adv.	conj.		total.
El.	19	11	4	6	4	3	0	=	47
Jul.	10	4	1	3	4	3	1	=	26
H.	8	1	10	0	1	1	0	=	21

That no one may be compelled to rely blindly upon the tables above given, the lists of words are added.

I. ἅπαξ λεγόμενα.

El. 1—137: câserdôm 8, lêodhwæt 11, lindgeborga 11, herecombol 25, wælrûn 28, burgent 31, burgwîgende 34, gûðgelæca 43, clynnan 51, campwudu 51, wælfel 53, hornbora 54, câfe 56, cêas 56, werodlêst 63, onbregdan 75, friðowebba 88, heorucumbol 107, hildegesa 112, handgeswing 115, gring 115, þrǽcheard 123, gringan 126, friðelêas 127, heaðofremmende 130, healfcwic 133.

Jul. 1—137: lytesnâ 10, firencræft 14, brêatan 16, bôccræftig 16, gǽstan 17, ǽhtwelig 18, biweddian 33, mâððumgesteald 36, wîfgift 38, goldspêdig 39, hǽðenfeoh 53, gesinge 54, hygeblind 61, hlǽnan 63, hildeþremma 64, sweor 65. 78, âðum 65, mǽglufe 70, gedafen 87, yreþweorg 90, ǽhtspêdig 101, êadlufe 104, mǽgrǽden 109, brŷdlufe 114, ǽhtgesteald 115, þrêanîedlîc 128, hǽstlîce 136.

II. Words not used elsewhere by C.

El. 1—137: hwyrft 1, þinggemearc 3, heretêma 10, gûðweard 14, wælhlence 24, hearding 25. 130, fyrdlêoð 27, ûrigfeðera 29. 111, beaduþrêat 31,

---

[1]) cn. = compound nouns; sn. = simple nouns etc.

âwer 33, ymbsittend 33, âbannan 34, êoredcest 36, ælfylce 36, stærcedfyrhð 38, wîcian 38. 65, âhyðan 41, ceasterwaran 42, rand 50, hrefn 52. 110, ofermægen 64, nihtlang 67, gefær 68, swefan 70, swefn 71, hiwbeorht 73, hwôpan 82, hæs 86, lôcian 87, geglengan 90, bôcstæf 91, âwrîtan 91, onlîce 99, hêra 101, wreccan 106, wæpenþracu 106, wælhrêow 112, flân 117, geolorand 118, stîðhydig 121, bordhrêða 122, þûf 123, sweot 124, instæpes 127, flêon 127. 134, stânclif 135, drenc 136.

Jul. 1—137: græswong 6, þryðfull 12, hæðengield 15. 22, rondburg 19, hordgestrêon 22, weoh 23, hordloca 43, swencan 47, unwâclîce 50, hæste 56, fêrend 60, orwyrðu 69, weorce 72. 135, tâlu 73, swîðferð 78, winburg 83, sparian 85, nemne 109, eoder 113, elles 113, ungeâra 124, geþafian 126, þingræden 126, ongin 127, gelica 128, bêotian 137.

This comparison proves very plainly that the vocabulary of H. is quite in accord with that of C.; that it indeed shows much less deviation from his usage than two passages of equal length from his indisputably genuine works, which passages may well be taken as fairly representative of the language of the author. The Riddles would probably show more *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,* while some parts of Cri. might show less, but it would be hard to find anywhere in CW. 137 lines that contain fewer new or strange words than H. But I am not content to rest here. A careful examination of these new words in H. reveals the fact, that they are just such words as C. would likely have used; that is, in the case of the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα,* we find that C. uses other *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in considerable number, made up of exactly the same elements, and in the case of the words used elsewhere but foreign to CW., we find words of similar formation in repeated instances occurring but once in CW. A broad statement like this avails nothing without specific proof, and I therefore proceed to give that proof in the case of each word separately, so far as I have been able to find it. And first then the

ἅπαξ λεγόμενα.

1. 2. bimænan 4, berêotan 6.

In CW. we find the simple verb mænan R. 21_{11}. 61_{17}, Gu. 1206; rêotan Cri. 836. 1230; mænan forms no other compound; rêotan one other, wiðrêotan, which occurs only once and that in CW., viz., El. 369. We find a number of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* in CW. with be-, bi-

a) where the simple verb occurs in CW., as is the case with the two instances in H.: bihlænan Jul. 577, beþennan R. 27_{12}, bescînan R. 72_{17}, behycgan Gu. 1323, belâcan R. 61_{7}, belibban Gu. 1282, beþuncan

R. 49_7, bifeohtan R. 4_{32}, bihlæ̂nan Cri. 870, birinnan Cri. 1176, bisêon (perfundere, in spite of Toller-Bosworth: vid. Siev. § 383, anm. 4) Cri. 1088, bisweðian Cri. 1644.

b) where the simple verb is used, but not by C.: besincan R. 11_{13}, bispanan Jul. 294, beclingan El. 696, biþryccan Cri. 1446.

c) where the simple verb does not occur at all[1]): beclŷsan Cri. 323, behlŷðan R. 15_{10}, bewæ̂fan R. 70_1, besylcan El. 697, biweddian Jul. 33.

3. ôðrîdan 40.

rîdan is common enough, and especially frequent in R.; the other compounds gerîdan and faroðrîdende do not occur in CW. C. uses 8 compounds of ôð + vb., of which number 3 are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα:

a) where the simple verb is in use but not by C.: ôðcerran Jul. 338, ôðbredan Gu. 826.

b) where the simple verb is not in use: ôðclîfan Cri. 1267.

4. geondflôwan 105.

The simple vb. flôwan is not uncommon; in CW. only once, Cri. 985. Of other compounds C. uses underflôwan R. 11_2 (Ms. underfloren), and hunigflôwende Gu. 1250. The most of the compounds with geond are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. C. uses 3 exclusive of geondsprengde R. 27_8, which is read by Grein but does not stand in the Ms.; 2 out of these 3 are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα:

a) where the simple verb occurs in CW., as is the case with geondflôwan: geondsêcan Cri. 973.

b) where the simple verb is not in use: geondsprêatan Cri. 42.

5. æðelcund 1.

Compounds with æðel are not numerous, but C. shows proportionately a rather frequent use of them. Four such occur in CW., one of which is a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, viz. æðelduguð Cri. 1012.[2])

Fritzsche remarked the fondness C. has for compounds with -cund, of which he uses 5, and though none of them are properly ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, yet one of them is not found ontside of CW., viz. weoruldcund Cri. 212. 285.[3])

6. eorðærn 3. 12. 19.

This word must be reckoned to the ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, although it does occur more than once. The simple term for grave, græf, does not occur in CW.; a more usual word, byrgen, is found Cri. 729. 1468, El. 186. 484. 652. More often, however, C. uses some compound, by means of which the idea is expressed in a more poetical manner; thus, foldærn Cri. 730, Gu. 1004, foldgræf El. 845, Cri. 1026, moldgræf Jul. 690, sandhof Gu. 1169, eorðgræf R. 59_9, þêostorcôfa Gu. 1168.

---

[1]) Let it not be forgotten that no reference is had to the A.-S. prose literature.

[2]) The others are æðelcyning Cri. 907, El. 219, æðelîc Cri. 308, æðeltungol Gu. 1288.

[3]) The others are ufancund Cri. 503, Gu. 1097. 1216, upcund Cri. 268, heofoncund Cri. 379, godcund Cri. 638. 670, El. 1033.

7. êasterniht 15.

The word êaster is not found in the A.-S. poets; 3 compounds thereof are used by them, one of which, a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, occurs in CW., viz. êastortîd Gu. 1075.

The word niht forms the second element of 3 other compounds, 2 of which are used by C. though they are not ἅπαξ λεγόμενα.[1])

8. nîðloc[an] 64.

Compounds in which nîð forms the first element are quite frequent; C. uses 5 such, 2 of which are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, viz. nîðsceaða R. 16_{24}, nîðcwalu Cri. 1258.[2])

The word loca is quite frequent in CW., occurring there 4 times and only once elsewhere. Of compounds with -loca C. uses 8, of which 2 are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, viz. þêosterloca El. 485, brægnloca R. 72_2, though the Ms. has here hrægnloca.[3])

9. bealuclom 65.

C. uses 5 compounds with bealu, three of which are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, viz. bealurâp Cri. 365, bealusearu Jul. 473, bealuþanc Jul. 469.[4])

The other compounds with -clom are mostly ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, but not used in CW.

10. heorusceorp 73.

The word heoru occurs for the most part only in compounds, of which C. uses 5. Two of these are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, viz., heoruscearp R. 6_8, heorucumbol El. 107.[5])

Sceorp is used only in compounds, all of which are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα. C. uses 2 of these, viz. fyrdsceorp R. 15_{13}, hlêosceorp R. 10_5.

11. helledorum.

We shall consider this word here, although it might be better to write the two words separately. There are 11 such compounds used by C., 5 of which are ἅπαξ λεγόμενα, viz. hellebealu Cri. 1427, hellecynn Cri. 1620, hellesceaða El. 957, hellesêað Jul. 422, helleþegen Gu. 1042.[6])

The simple word dor does not occur in CW., but we find there a compound and ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, wealdor Cri. 328.

12. 13. gedyrst 109, sandgrot 117.

In the case of these two words it is impossible to say anything for

---

[1]) These are middelneaht R. 87_7 and sinneaht Cri. 117. 1543. 1632.

[2]) The other 3 are nîðheard El. 195, nîðhycgende Cri. 1110, nîðwracu Jul. 187.

[3]) The other 6 are bânloca Cri. 769, Jul. 476, Gu. 953, brêostloca El. 1250, ferðloca Jul. 79. 234, hearmloca El. 695, hordloca Jul. 43, hreðerloca El. 86, Cri. 1056, Gu. 1237.

[4]) The other two are bealudæd Cri. 1302, El. 515, bealuful Cri. 259. 909.

[5]) The others are heorudrêorig El. 1215, heorugîfre Cri. 977. 1060, Jul. 567. 586, heorugrim Gu. 952, Cri. 1524. 1613, El. 119, R. 41_{55}.

[6]) The others are helledeofol Jul. 629, El. 901, helleduru El. 1230, hellefŷr Cri. 1270, hellegâst Jul. 457. 615, hellegrund Cri. 265. 562, El. 1305, hellehæftling Jul. 246.

or against C.'s authorship. Even the meaning of the former one is uncertain, and Thorpe's translation, tribulatio, is hard to reconcile with the adj. gedyrstig etc. and O. H. G. gaturst, audacia. C. uses two other ἅπαξ λεγόμενα of which sand forms the first element of composition, viz. sandhof Gu. 1169, sandland Gu. 1308.

14. rêon 6.

It is doubtful whether we have a new word here, or an acc. to the adj. rêow. Grein prefers the former explanation, and, if that be correct, we may draw an argument for C. from the fact that the adj. rêonig, with similar meaning, occurs three times in CW. and nowhere else. The three places are El. 834. 1083, Jul. 530.

15. Nâma 122.

In the case of a simple substantive as here it is hardly possible to adduce much for or against C.'s authorship, and the difficulty is made the greater because of the loss of several words out of the text. That we have a new word and not nama, name, is rendered probable by the presence of the forms þînre and þâ. That Grein has restored the passage correctly either in his text 'fore þînre me[nniscnisse mænig]an nâma', or in his Sprachschatz, 'for þînre me[aglan mǽr]an nâma', is by no means certain[1]), though his explanation of the word through O. H. G. nâma is probably correct. If we do have here a perfectly new word it is nothing surprising; Jul. 1—137 has sweor 65. 78 and âðum 65, El. 1—137 has cêas 56 and gring 115.

In this list of ἅπαξ λεγόμενα neither hroðorleas 62, nor witodlîce 30, has been included; in the one case the Ms. has broðorleas, and in the other the reading is more likely witod talige.

We now proceed to the second class of words under consideration, that is, words foreign to CW., though in use elsewhere. A good many of these are compound verbs in good and frequent use in other monuments of A.-S. poetry, and in all cases except one[2]) the simple verb is used by C. Under each verb discussed we shall cite all similar instances of compounds with the same prefix that occur in CW. The following two facts are therefore true of each word thus cited; first, the simple verb occurs in CW.; secondly, the compound occurs in CW. only in the passage indicated, though it is found elsewhere in A.-S. poetry.

1. âcôlian 6.

The simple verb côlian occurs El. 883, Gu. 1281. The prefix â is quite common and C. use 97 compounds therewith. According to the

---

[1]) Schipper saw the letters -anian before nama in the Ms.

[2]) oflyst.

principles above laid down, the following may be mentioned here: abannan El. 34, âbelgan R. 21_{32}, âbîdan Cri. 1631, âbrêotan El. 510, âbûgan Cri. 56, âcwellan Jul. 303, âdwæscan Cri. 1133, âfêdan El. 914, âfyllan Cri. 1563, âgangan El. 1, âgân El. 1227, âhycgan Cri. 903, âhŷðan El. 41, âlecgan Cri. 1423, àsǽlan El. 1244, âscûfan R. 87_6, àsêoðan El. 1308, âspyrian El. 467, âþencan Cri. 990, âþringan R. 4_{12}, âweallan Cri. 625, âwrîtan El. 91.

2. behabban 18.

The instances of the simple verb habban in CW. are so numerous that it is unnecessary to mention them. Of compounds with be- C. uses 65 the ones to be quoted here according to our rule are as follows: bedelfan El. 1081, befæðman R. 88_{19}, begêotan El. 1248, begrindan R. 27_6, belûcan El. 1027, bemurnan Cri. 176, bescûfan El. 943, beseftan El. 1026, besêon El. 83, besittan El. 473, besnyðian R. 27_1, betǽcan El. 585, bewrecan El. 251, bewrîhan R. 43_{24}, bewyrcan R. 36_3.

3. onwacan 21.

The simple verb wacan occurs R. 21_{21}. Of compounds with on- C. uses 47. The following are to be mentioned here: onberan Gu. 917, onhnîgan R. 31_7, onhrêran Cri. 826, onhweorfan Cri. 618, onhyrdan El. 841, onlŷhtan Cri. 204, onlŷsan Cri. 68, onsacan Jul. 194, onþêon R. 64_2, onþringan Gu. 1300, onwindan El. 1250.

4. oflyst 81.

In regard to this word it is impossible to say much for C.'s authorship. The simple verb lystan does not occur in CW., is rather characteristic of Met. Oflysted is used twice in An., but nowhere else. Of compounds with of- C. uses only 5, two of which belong here, viz. ofslêan Cri. 1480, ofunnan Jul. 377.

5. geondfêran 101.

As was stated under the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον*, geondflôwan, C. uses only 3 compounds with geond-, but none of them can be quoted here to illustrate the use of geondfêran.

6. gerîman 116.

Rîman is not very frequently used; occurs in CW. only Jul. 505; the substantive gerîm is found Jul. 314. Of all the prefixes, ge- is probably the most common. In CW. alone may be found 245 such compounds. The following belong here: gebîtan Cri. 13, gebeorgan Gu. 963, geblôwan Gu. 1249, gebodian Cri. 202, gebrengan Jul. 691, gecêapian R. 24_{13}, gedrêfan Cri. 168, gedrêosan Cri. 265, gedwellan Cri. 1128, geefnan El. 1015, geearnian El. 526, gefaran El. 872, geflêogan Cri. 295, gefrætwan R. 54_8, gefricgan El. 155, gefylgan El. 576, gehrêosan Cri. 939, gehweorfan El. 1126, gehrêowan Cri. 1494, gehrînan Gu. 1000, gehwyrfan Cri. 188, gehycgan Cri. 1398, gemynian Jul. 721, gemyrran Jul. 412, genemnan El. 741, gesǽlan Cri. 736, gescêadan El. 149, gesceaðan Gu. 842, gescrîfan El. 1047, gesîgan Gu. 1243, gestǽlan Gu. 1084, geteohhian Jul. 264, getremman Cri. 1151, geþafian Jul. 126, geþêon R. 41_{01}, geþŷwan R. 61_{14}, gewefan R. 41_{85}, geweaxan R. 78_6, gewindan R. 41_{99}, gewinnan Cri. 1001, gewrixlan Cri. 1261, gewuldrian Cri. 98, geŷcan Cri. 1040.

7. gemiltsian 109.

Miltsian occurs Jul. 449; all the compounds with ge- mentioned under the preceeding word belong here equally as well.

8. ymbstondan 124.

Compounds with ymb- are not by any means frequent; only 5 such are used in CW. one of which belongs here, viz. ymbsellan El. 742.

9. ymbfôn 115.

What was said under the preceeding word belongs also here. Compounds of fôn seem rather favored by C. Ont of 12 such he uses 6, though all of these except one[1]) are in frequent use elsewhere. These six are as follows: âfôn Cri. 1184, Jul. 326, anfôn R. 43_3, (be-) bifôn Cri. 80, El. 843, Cri. 527. 1158, R. 41_{52}. 27_{14}, Gu. 967, Jul. 350, forfôn Cri. 874, Jul. 284. 552, gefôn Cri. 1513, Jul. 98. 191, onfôn Cri. 418, El. 1033, and 20 other times in CW.

10. oferweorpan 133.

Compounds with ofer- are also rather infrequent; C. uses only 5, of which number 3 belong here: ofertêon Gu. 1254, ofertîgan R. 67_6, oferwinnan Cri. 1690.

Out of 9 compounds with weorpan C. uses 4: âweorpan El. 771, 763, Cri. 98, 1405, R. 41_{49}, (bi-) beweorpan R. 1_5, 81_{34}, tôweopan Jul. 650, 566, El. 430, wiðweorpan Cri. 3, El. 294.

The most of the other words belonging under this head are compound substantives; in the use of the simple substantives H. agrees exactly with CW. except in two rather doubtful cases already mentioned under *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, viz. nama and rêon, and mônað here to be noticed.

11. wîfman 16, 48.

There are five compounds of wîf + subs. C. uses wîfgift Jul. 38 and wîflufe Jul. 296.

12. helmberend 37.

Such compounds of berend with an object are quite common and C. uses his full share of them: dêaðberend Gu. 822, feorhberend R. 40_6, gâstberend Cri. 1600, R. 21_8, reordberend Cri. 278. 381. 1369. 1025, El. 1282, segenberend R. 41_{20}.

13. burggeat 38.

Of compounds in which burg forms the first element C. uses the following: burgâgend El. 1175, burghlið R. 28_2, burgland Cri. 51, burgsæl Gu. 1258. 1305, R. 58_5, burgsettende Cri. 337, R. 26_3, El. 276, burgstede Gu. 1291, Cri. 812, burgwaru Cri. 742, burgweall Cri. 978, burgwîgende El. 34.

14. burgwaran 56, 134.

The above mentioned compounds are also applicable here. We find in A.-S. poetry compounds with -waru and -waran often side by side, and in the case of one form, the dat. pl., it is impossible to decide

[1]) âfôn.

from which nom. form it is to be derived. As regards ceasterwarum El. 42, Grein is undecided whether the nom. is -ware or -waran.[1]) Hellwarum he gives under helwaran, and so also eorðwarum Cri. 697. 723, but burgwarum Cri. 742 he gives inconsistently under burgwaru. We have equal right to place the form under burgwaran, which will enable us then to quote an example from CW. of the word under consideration and therefore strike it from our list. We find anyhow in CW. a rather indiscriminate use of both forms; thus gen. pl. Romwara El. 9. 40 and Romwarena El. 982; so also helwara Cri. 286 and hellwarena Cri. 731, Jul. 322. 437.

15. cyneþrym 51. 74.

Of compounds with cyne — C. uses the following: cynelîce Cri. 157, cynestol Cri. 51. 1217, El. 330, cyneword R. 44_{16}. The following examples of compounds with — þrym are found in CW.; godþrym Cri. 139, hêahþrym Gn. 1298, mægenþrym El. 735, Cri. 296. 352. 557. 1009, Jul. 154.

16. eftcyme 130.

Compounds with eft — are rather rare; C. has only eftlêan Cri. 1100, The word cyme occurs quite frequently in CW. and so also other compounds there of, viz. hêrcyme Cri. 250, hidercyme Cri. 142. 587. 367, seldcyme R. 1_{14}, þrymcyme Gn. 1230, upcyme R. 319.

17. monþwǽre 77.

The nearest approach to the word in CW. is geþwǽre R. 3_{15}, 61_{6}, Cri. 127.

18. dægrêd 9.

The word is really found in CW., though in a compound form, viz. dægrêdwôma Gu. 1266, Other compounds of dæg used by C. are: dægwôma Gu. 1191, dægweorðung El. 1234, dægweorc El. 146, dægtid R. 18_{3}. 7_{16}, dægrîm R. 88_{2}, dægcondel R. 88_{26}.

19. hagostealdd 21.

In R. 21_{31} we find the same word though in a derived, abstract use. In R. 15_{2} we have hagostealdmon, and R. 55_{3} hægstealdmon.

20. mônaȝ 28.[2])

That this word does not occur in CW, can only be owing to the accident that he had no occasion to use it. For the same reason it is not found in B. nor in any of the so called poems of Cædmon.

21. ênd 71.

This word occurs nowhere else in A.-S. literature except Sat. 426, where Grein substitutes it for Ms. and. If Grein's reading is not allowed the word must be transferred to the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*.

As the result of this detailed examination we may hold with still greater positiveness to our assertion, that the vocabulary of H. shows a remarkably slight deviation from that

[1]) Zupitza and Toller-Bosworth give nom. ceasterware.

[2]) Schipper reports the Ms. as having monat: this is then probably an oversight of the scribe for monað; cf. Cri. 590 wunað, Ms. wunat.

of CW., and even the new words can be parallelled for the most part by numerous similar instances out of Cynewulf's own works. It remains here to add several words occurring in H. that are especially characteristic of C.

1. sigebearn 11. 32. 43. 50.

Also found El. 481. 863. 1147, Cri. 520, but does not occur elsewhere.

2. beofian 20, 86.

In CW. Cri. 883. 828. 1015. 1021. 1145, Jul. 708, El. 759, R. 4_9, Gu. 1299; outside of CW. only five times.

3. byrnwîgend 38.

In CW. El. 224. 235; outside of CW. only once.

4. loc 39.

In CW. Cri. 321, El. 1027; elsewhere only once.

5. clustor 40.

In CW. Jul. 236, Cri. 314; elsewhere only twice.

6. bilûcan 54.

Used 9 times in CW.; the form belûcan, however, is common enough elsewhere.

7. ord 56.

The meaning princeps belongs to this word also in the phrase æðelinga ord which occurs only in CW.; viz. El. 393, Cri. 515. 741. 846. Elsewhere there is only one example where ord has this meaning cited by Grein; viz. By. 69.

8. cild 35.

The usual word used by the poets is bearn: cild does not occur in B., the so called poems of Cædmon, nor in any of the doubtful poems of C. except Ph. 639. In CW. the word occurs; Cri. 218. 725, El. 336. 776, Gu. 1335: elsewhere only Edg. 31, Ph. 639, Ps. 63_7.

9. cildhâd 119.

Elsewhere only El. 915, in El. 336. 776, Gu. 1335 we have cildes hâd written separately. Abstract nouns compounded with hâd seem especially frequent in C., for as many examples of such words can be cited from his works as from all the rest of A.-S. poetry.

10. baðian 132.

In CW., R. 26_6; elsewhere only Wand. 47, and there without object, as a reflexive verb.

Grammatical Examination.

An examination of the forms in H. is not out of place in a study such as is here attempted, though nothing of very positive weight is thereby gained for the question of authorship. All the declensions of the noun are represented. The o-declension has some 70 representatives, next comes the a-de-

clension, to which have been counted some 25 nouns; the i-decl. has only the following four examples, viz., *wên* 82, *sǣ* 117, *ǣrist* 121, *eftcyme* 130; the u-decl. only two, viz., *helleduru* 53, *hond* 97. 125. The weak and consonant declensions stand on equal footing, having each 17 examples. The consonant decl. allows perhaps more variety of form than any of the others, and it may not be amiss to quote the forms found in H.

I. -nd stems; voc. sing. scyppend 109, waldend 112, gen. sing. hǣlendes 18, nom. pl. ealdfînd 89, gen. pl. helmberenda 37, dat. pl. fêondum 98, acc. pl. foldbûende 105, byrnwîgend 38. These forms are all usual and admit of no comment.

II. -r stems: gen. sing. môdor 110, acc. sing. dôhtor 10, gen. pl. hêahfædra 47. This last form is a little peculiar. Jul. 514 we find hêahfædera and so also Ex. 357 and An. 792. Sievers[1]) gives the form fædra as dialectic.

III. miscellaneous examples[2]): nom. pl. mægð 1; so in Gu. 833, but in R. 51_7 mægeð: nom. sing. hæleð 24, nom. pl. hæleð 7, 13, gen. pl. hæleða 47; the form hæleð as nom. or acc. pl. occurs 13 times in CW.; rarer and not at all in CW. are the forms hæleðas and hæleðe: dat sing. êasterniht 15; niht has always uninflected form of the dat. sing. in CW. and occurs thus, Cri. 878. 873, Gu. 991. 1001. 1191, Jul. 626; nom. pl. wîfmenn 16, gen. pl. wîfmonna 48; does not occur in CW.: nom. sing. burg 129, gen. sing. burge 35, acc. sing. burg 18; in CW. burg is declined as follows; dat. sing. byrig 11 times, byrg twice; acc. sing. burg 3 times, gen. pl. burga 3 times, dat. pl. burgum 18 times: mônað 28; does not occur in CW.

While treating this part of the subject it may be well to notice those substantives found in H. that show a variation in gender.[3])

feorh 20, gender here uncertain; in CW. both m. and n., thus Cri. 439, m. R. 11_6. 14_3, n.

wîfmon 16. 48; gender here uncertain; the word is not used in CW., elsewhere it occurs both as m. and f.

þŷstre 55; uncertain whether from þêostor n. or þêostru f. Many of the forms in CW., may come from either, but some of them must come from the latter; thus þŷstro acc. sing. Cri. 227.

bend 61. 68. 88; in all three instances the gender is doubtful; elsewhere the word occurs both as m. and f. In CW. the f. can be proven from acc. pl. bende R. 4_{15}. 21_{30}, and benda Cri. 68; the m. is not to be

---

[1]) Siev. § 285, Anm. 2a.

[2]) For the remaining examples the corresponding forms out of CW. are given for the sake of comparison.

[3]) Cf. Platt, Angelsächsisches. 1. Zur Kenntniss der ags. Geschlechter Anglia VI, 171—174.

proven as acc. sing. bend Cri. 1042 may be f[1]); C. uses a similar form wyn Jul. 641.

ellen 66; used both as m. and n. Probably originally n., since Goth. aljan und O. H. G. ellan are both n. No positive proof of m. in CW. but it does so occur An. 1244.

lof 102, m. and n.; gender not to be proved out of CW.

sǽ 117, m. and f.; C. uses it often as m., but no certain example of the f. can be found in his works.

ǽrist 121; here m. and so often elsewhere; the word does not occur in CW. except Gu. 1073, and there the gender is uncertain.

burne 132; here f. The word only used by C. R. 28_{16}, and there the gender is uncertain; elsewhere we find the m. form burna.

fullwiht 136. Grein in his Sprachschatz does not mark the gender; Groschopp[2]) marks if f. n. (m.?); Sweet's Reader gives it only m.; Toller-Bosworth only n. The form of gen. fullwihtes El. 490. 1034 indicates m. or n.; the phrase þurh fulwihte El. 172 is not perfectly decisive for f., as þurh might be followed by the dat.[3]) cf. Job. V, þurh þâm micclum costnungum.[4])

In regard to adjectives and verbs we find the forms altogether as usual with the same ordinary variations. Two peculiar verbal forms however do appear; *sêton* 81, and *hŷrde* 83. The former seems to be the creeping in of a dialectic form and the latter must surely be an error for *hŷrden*; Thorpe mentions among the peculiarities of the Exeter Ms. the use of the 3rd pers. sing. for the 3rd pers. pl.[5]) The use of the form *hêht* 10, is in accordance with the usage of C., as is also the form *cwom* 9. 17. Fritzsche[6]) found 25 examples of *cwom, cwôme, cwôman, becwom, becwoman* in CW.[7]) and only two of *com*. The form *lêt* 125, is also the most common form in C. as elsewhere, although the fuller form *lêort* does occur El. 1105.

In regard to the inflection of the pronouns, there is only one point worthy of being noticed. Fritzsche bases an argument against the genuineness of An. as one of Cynewulf's works on the ground that the forms of the pers. pron. *mec* and *þec*

---

[1]) Siev. § 257, Anm. 2.

[2]) Kleines angelsächsisches Wörterbuch. Kassel, 1883.

[3]) March, A.-S. Gram. § 353 II.

[4]) Grein's Bib. d. Ags. Prosa I, p. 267, line 4.

[5]) Thorpe, Cod. Ex., Preface p. V, note 2.

[6]) Anglia II, p. 481.

[7]) Gu. is not reckoned to CW.; for this he says, 'nur Gû. 1114 findet sich com, an 12 andern stellen cwom und cwôman'.

fail entirely, and *ûsic* and *êowic* occur very rarely in that poem. At first sight it would seem as if our poem stood on a worse footing than An. in this particular, as these forms are not to be found anywhere in Thorpe's text. Schipper, however, saw distinctly *ûsic* in v. 94 and in v. 96 he says, 'Hinter *us* ist *ic* ausradiert'; so again v. 107 he reads *þec* and says, 'Das *c* halb ausradiert'. This rubbing out is probably the work of some later corrector (?) of the Ms.

§ 6. Epithets and Phrases.

Closely connected with the subjects treated in section 4 is the use of certain phrases or epithets for the designation of particular personages. The richest field for these epithets in H. is to be found in the expressions used for Christ. Here we find a variety that at first sight is astonishing, and though some of the expressions are new, yet the most of them can be found in CW.

1. The following are the most common ones and occur quite often in A.-S. poetry.

1. god sylf 52, El. 209, Cri. 135. Oftener we find god used alone, Jul. 265, Cri. 109. 535 etc.

2. cyning 40. 85, El. 460. 453. 934, Cri. 578. 797. 1209. 1627. 1630. 1663.

3. þêoden 59. 130, El. 563, Cri. 541. 1097. 1237.

4. dryhten 31. 70, El. 717, Cri. 257. 594. 601. 931. 1022. 1109. 1159.

5. hlâford 67, Cri. 461. 498, 518. 574, Gu. 1331.

6. hǣlend 18. 26. 107. 118, El. 809. 912. 920, Cri. 435. 505. 634. 792.

7. æðeling 3. 5. 19, Cri. 448. 627. 743, El. 886; cf. wuldres æðeling Cri. 158, and æðelinga ord Cri. 515. 741. 846.

8. þêoda waldend 112, El. 421. 781.

9. weoruda dryhten 126. 133, El. 897, Cri. 428.

10. heofona helm 34, Jul. 722; cf. heofonrices helm Cri. 566.

11. mundbora 75, Jul. 156. 213, Cri. 28.

12. cnyht 79, El. 339.

13. cild 85, Cri. 218.

2. The following expressions occur only in H.

14. hagostealdd 21.

15. sygebearn 43; cf. Cri. 520, ealra sigebearna þæt sêleste.

16. mægenþrym 22; cf. Cri. 726 ealra þrymma þrym, 740 wuldres þrym, El. 816 allra cyninga þrym, Cri. 917 mægencyning.

17. (Johannis) mǣge 25. 27.

18. rêðust ealra cyninga 36.

19. sêlast ealra cyninga 117.

20. cyninga sêlast 119; the use of a superlative with the gen. is frequent in CW.[1]); cf. Cri. 520 ealra sigebearna þæt sêleste.

21. cyneþrymma wyn 74.

22. ealles folces fruma 29. 41; cf. Cri. 516 ealra folca fruma; in Hy. 10_{10} we have folces fruma.

3. The following occur in H. and also elsewhere in A.-S. poetry, but not in CW.

23. frêa moncynnes 33, Hy. 9_{14}; cf. Cri. 925 frêa ealra gesceafta.

24. dryhten god 92[2]), Jud. 300, Ps. 55, An. 1464; cf. El. 760 god dryhten.

25. dryhten Crist 108, Gu. 564.

26. sigedryhten god. 111, Met. 20_{260}.

27. rîce dryhten 116, Ps. 96_1.

28. monna scyppend 109, An. 486, Ps. 50_8 (Cot.); cf. Jul. 181 gæsta scyppend, Cri. 266 hæleða scyppend.

4. The following occur only in H. and CW.

29. sigebearn godes 11. 32. 50, El. 481. 863. 1147; the word sigebearn occurs only in H. and CW.

30. wilcuma 58, Cri. 554.

31. æðelinga wyn 121, Jul. 730 uses this expression for God; other writers use it freely of things in general.

32. weoruda wuldorgiefa 42; El. 681.

H. shows further a number of phrases and expressions similar to those in CW. Sometimes this likeness is not remarkably striking and often other poems show passages somewhat similar. For the sake of perfect fairness such cases are mentioned, but the argument for C.'s authorship rests not on one passage but on the number of such passages. Cases of single agreement between H. and other poems may be found, but nowhere can 5000 lines be picked out which show the same amount of such passages as CW.

H. 10 eorles dôhtor.
R. 78_5 eorles dôhtor.
H. 56 âbêad bealdlîce.
R. 61_{16} âbêodan bealdlîce.
H. 88 Bona weorces gefeah.
El. 849 Cwên weorces gefeah.
El. 110 hrefn weorces gefeah.
H. 129 efne swâ þêah.

---

[1]) Gaebler, Ueber die Autorschaft des Angelsächsischen Gedichtes vom Phoenix, Anglia III, p. 512.

[2]) Perhaps sigedryhten god. Schipper, Germania XIX, p. 335.

R. 40_{27} efne sê þêah.
R. 66_{1} efne sê þêah.
H. 20 folde beofode.
Cri. 882 beofað middangeard.
Cri. 1145 eorðe beofode.[1])
H. 55 se þegn wæs on wynne.
R. 54_{2} þæt trêow wæs on wynne.[2])
H. 30 wêne ic ful swiðe and witod [talige].
Jul. 357 Ic þæt wênde and witod tealde.
H. 86 we þæs bêofiende
under helledorum hearde sceoldon
bîdan in bendum.
Cri. 146 Nu hie sôfte þæs
bidon in bendum, hwonne bearn godes
cwôme tô cêarigum.
H. 110 þu fore monna lufan þînre môdor bôsm
sylfa gesôhtes.
Cri. 1434 and fore monna lufan nûn þrowade
hêafod hearmslege.

Compare further: fore Cristes lufan Jul. 31, fore leahtra lufan Jul. 375, for lufan dryhtnes El. 491, for ælda lufan, Cri. 1117, for sâwla lufan El. 564.[3])

H. 113 ac for þâm miltsum, þe þu moncynne
oft ætŷwdest, þonne him wæs âre þearf.
Cri. 297 þæt þu sunu dryhtnes
þurh clêne gebyrd cennan sceolde
monnum tô miltse.[4])
H. 59 þe þæs þonc sîe, þêoden ûser,
þæt þu us [sylfa hider] sêcan woldest.
Cri. 127 We þæs þonc mâgon
secgan sigedryhten symle bi gewyrhtum,
þæs þe he hine sylfne us sendan wolde!
Cri. 598 Wuldor þæs âge
þrŷnysse þrym, þonc bûtan ende!
El. 810 Sie þe, mægena god,
þrymsittendum þonc bûtan ende.

Cf. further Cri. 127. 599, El. 893.

H. 67 þonne he his hlâfordes hyldo gelŷfed.

---

[1]) wongas beofiað. Dôm. 112.
sceal eorðe beofian Ps. 95_{9}.
[2]) weorod wæs on wynne B. 2015.
[3]) for manna lufan Men. 36.
for meotudes lufan Men. 82.
fore sâwle lufan Fä. 78.
[4]) monnum tô miltse Az. 138.

Cri. 119 nu we hyhtfulle hælo gelŷfað.
H. 95 We þurh gîfre môd
beswican us sylfe.
Cri. 362 Hû we sind geswencte þurh ûre sylfra gewill.
H. 98 sculon êac tô ussum fêondum freoðo wilnian.[1])
Cri. 773 utan us tô fæder freoða wilnian.
H. 35 wolde .... þǽre burge þrym
onginnan rêafian.
Cri. 558 Hafað nu se hâlga helle berêafod.
H. 53 Geseah he helleduru hǽdre scînan
þâ þe longe ǽr bilocen wǽron.
Cri. 251 and þâ gyldnan geatu, þe in geârdagum
ful longe ǽr bilocen stôdan.

§ 7. Versification.

The subject of A.-S. metre is quite fully treated in the first book of Schipper's 'Englische Metrik'. An examination of H. shows that all the main laws as there expounded are carefully observed. Our poem belongs, together with all the works of C., to the classical period of A.-S. poetry. Yet we cannot expect to find a perfect agreement in all particulars with the genuine works of C., since we do not find any such agreement between those works themselves. In fact, the whole system of A.-S. metre allows so much liberty that anything like a strict and exhaustive comparison between any two poems is impossible. Yet there are some points in which a comparison is possible and instructive. We can notice the relative frequency of two or three alliterating syllables in the verse; the relation of arsis to thesis; the frequency of anacrusis etc., but even in these points we must not try to draw the lines too closely or demand a too mechanical structure. The usage of C. in these particulars has already been given by Fritzsche in his examination of An. The results of that examination will here be given and a comparison instituted at each point with H.[2])

[1]) The phrase freoðo wilnian occurs elsewhere four times.

[2]) F.'s statements as to C.'s usage have been accepted without being subjected to a careful examination. No two persons would likely reach the same conclusions however carefully their respective examinations might be made, yet a slight variation could in no wise affect the comparison here instituted between CW. and H.

a) Number of alliterating syllables. 'In den Rä. überwiegt die dreifache alliteration, ebenso in Cri.; in El. und Jul. tritt die form hinter dem inhalte in etwas zurück, die zweifache überwiegt'. In H. we find a preponderance of twofold alliteration; out of 128 verses, 67 have two alliterating syllables and 57 have three; 3 have double alliteration, and 1 (v. 46) seems to have none, owing to the fact possibly that its place is supplied by a kind of rhyme or assonance between the words Esaias and Sacharias. The following verses have not been counted owing to the uncertain condition of the text; v. 92. 93. 94. 31. 32. 60. 122. 124. The following table shows the percentage.

Out of every 100 verses in[1])

	R.	Cri.	Jul.	El.	H.
verses with 2 allit. syl.	$49^1/_2$	45	$51^4/_7$	52	52. 3
verses with 3 allit. syl.	$50^1/_2$	55	$48^3/_7$	48	44. 5

The following table gives the number of verses with double alliteration

	R.	Cri.	Jul.	El.	H.
abab	8	15	9	18	1
abba	2	3	13	4	2

b) The alliterating letters. In CW., as indeed generally in A.-S. poetry, the vowels alliterate most frequently; then come the letters w, h, s, f.[2]) In H. the most frequently used letters are; h 17 times, vowels 16, s 16, b 15, m 14, w 13, f 11. The alliteration is usually pure and exact, that is, the same letter or combination occurs in each of the alliterating syllables. Sometimes, however, it is impure and the combinations do not thus correspond to one another. In the following list the usage of H. has been illustrated by referring to all the lines in CW. (including Gu., second part) where the same alliteration occurs.[3])

br, b-b 80. 86, El. 122. 257. 253. 873, Jul. 16. 41, R. 18_8. 22_7. 28_2, Cri. 293. 978. 1326. 1598.

---

[1]) F. must have reckoned the verses with two sets of alliterating syllables to the first row, otherwise the fact remains unexplained that his two figures always equal 100.

[2]) For nearer particulars see the tables given by Fritzsche p. 471.

[3]) If anyone is disposed to laugh at the carefulness with which these examples have been gathered, it can only be said that no great authority

b, br-b 97, El. 114. 162, Jul. 581, Gu. 815. 826. 842. 1341, R. 4_3. 16_{15}. 56_7. Cri. 152. 483. 540. 882. 1073. 1394.

bl-b 134, El. 299. 389. 1126, Jul. 292, R. 32_{15}. 41_{16}. 84_6, Cri. 100. 552. 936. 1013. 1438.

b-bl 8, El. 354, Jul. 476, Gu. 1079. 1291, R. 29_5. 41_{59}. 58_2, Cri. 1127. 1175. 1292. 1636.

c-cn 79, El. 339, Gu. 791, R. 19_4.

cl, c-c 40, Jul. 618, Cri. 177.

d-dr 31, El. 136. 187. 193. 280. 342. 352. 358. 705. 717. 1160. 1168, Gu. 936. 1080. 1094. 1108, R. 13_{15}. 42_4. 52_5, Cri. 41. 804. 857. 887. 1159. 1206. 1476. 1545. 1628. 1637. 1651.

d, d-dr 108, El. 1291, Jul. 221, Cri. 118. 257. 428. 931. 1050.

dr, d-dr 70, El. 766, Cri. 1645.

f-fr 98. 33, El. 415. 850, Jul. 102. 123. 184. 225. 274, Gu. 795. 908, R. 8_6. 14_{10}. 17_{10}. 18_5. 21_{24}. 27_{26}. 32_9 und $_{10}$. 41_{46}. 56_{10}. $62_{1.3}$. 72_{23}. 87_6, Cri. 326. 369. 773. 1178. 1192. 1404. 1455.

f, fr-f 41, El. 261. 360. 646. 743. 925. 1106. 1143, Jul. 284. 347. 553. Gu. 895. 985. 1044. 1201, R. 54_8. 55_{12}. 89_3, Cri. 72. 187. 472. 475. 576. 579. 728. 1074. 1361. 1422.

fl-f 105, Jul. 384. 489, R. 32_8. $41_{77.\ 78}$. 56_2, Cri. 1466.

g-gl 76, El. 594, R. 25_5, Cri. 315. 911. 996. 1287. 1328.

h, h-hl 24, El. 475. 613. 1133, Jul. 526, R. 2_{15}. 15_{10}. 22_3. 87_9, Cri. 747. 1013. 1121. 1354. 1435.

hl, h-h 21, El. 1099. 1230, Jul. 189. 237, Gu. 872. 1129. 1307, R. 9_{10}, Cri. 669. 717. 835. 933. 949.

hl-h 67, El. 234, Jul. 243. 544, Gu. 868, R. 21_7. 56_{69}. 57_{11}. 59_{13}, Cri. 284. 450.

h-hr 62. 90, El. 20. 550. 764, R. 3_9. 16_{27}. 14_9. 21_{23}. 49_1. 54_{11}. 60_1, Cr. 749. 1413.

s, sn-s 23, El. 382, Cri. 442.

s-sw 72, El. 517. 1178. 1275, Jul. 355. 426, Gu. 823, R. 10_{12}. 14_2. 42_3. 61_{12}. 87_2, Cri. 80. 269. 281. 491. 543. 935. 950. 1222. 1459.

sw, s-s 96, El. 26, Jul. 51. 313, Gu. 1043. 1187. 1326, R. 11_3. 14_4. $16_{22.\ 25}$. 20_9. 27_{22}. 39_5. 40_3. 50_5. 58_3. 67_3, Cri. 9. 243. 512. 987. 1079. 1607.

w, w-wr 42, El. 84. 827, R. 25_1. 32_{18}. 34_1. 40_{24}. 41_{26}. 88_{15}, Cri. 622. 1515.

wr-w 63. 126, El. 926. 1020, Jul. 260, Gu. 877, R. 37_2. $41_{2.\ 6.\ 60.\ 102.\ 104}$. 45_1. 52_1. 60_{17}. 68_2. 69_5, Cri. 363.

c) Anacrusis, Arsis, and Thesis. 'Der auftakt des ersten halbverses (bei 100 versen ca. 25 mal) besteht aus 1—3 silben, nur äusserst selten vier, meist ist es nur eine silbe ... Im zweiten halbverse überwiegt der zweisilbige auftakt, und hier hat fast die hälfte aller verse einen solchen von 1—4 silben (4 selten) ... Der erste halbvers schliesst meist mit silben in

---

is claimed for the list; it is more a matter of interest than of weight. As an actual fact, however, the above list cannot be duplicated from Beowulf.

der senkung, ihre anzahl variirt zwischen 1 und 5. Der zweite halbvers schliesst höchstens mit 3 senkungen und dies selten genug, mehr als die hälfte aller zweiten halbverse schliessen mit nur einer senkung, ungefähr ein fünftel aller schliessen mit der vierten gehobenen silbe.'

In H.[1]) out of 128 verses counted 45 show anacrusis, 83 none. Of these 45 the anacrusis consists of one syllable in 21 cases, of 2 in 19, and of 3 in 5. In the second half-verse the proportion is about the same; 46 with, and 82 without anacrusis. In 15 cases the anacrusis consists of 1 syllable, in 18 of 2, in 9 of 3, and in 4 of 4. The first half-verse closes usually with a thesis, rarely with an accented syllable. Out of 129 verses counted 116 close the first half with a thesis, in 76 cases of 1 syllable, in 37 of 2, and 3 of 3. Only 13 verses close the first half with the arsis. In the second half-verse the ratio varies a little in favor of those verses that close with the arsis. Out of 127 verses counted 39 close thus, 70 of the remaining 88 verses close with a thesis of 1 syllable, 15 of 2, and only 3 of 3 syllables.

---

[1]) Owing to the uncertain condition of the text several verses had to be omitted in this examination.

VITA.

I was born on the 9th day of Sept. 1859, in Spartanburg, S. C., United States of America. After attending the usual primary schools, I entered the Freshman Class of Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C., in Oct. 1873, and at the end of the regular four years course graduated June 1877 with the degree Baccalaureus Artium. During the following year I pursued a special course of study in the classics, and received from the same institution June 1878 the degree Magister Artium. Being then chosen Tutor of Latin and Greek, I exchanged my place as student for that of teacher, which position I continued to hold till June 1883. Desirous of further prosecuting my studies, I then came to Leipzig University, where I was matriculated at the opening of the winter semester. During my stay here I have attended the lectures of Professors Wülker, Curtius, Lange, Lipsius, Voigt, Hildebrand, Brugmann, Hirzel, and Doctors Techmer and Kögel. Great profit and enjoyment have also been derived from connection with Prof. Dr. Wülker's 'Angelsächsische Gesellschaft', and from attending Dr. Kögel's 'Gotische Uebungen'. To all my instructors, both at home and abroad, I take this opportunity of returning sincerest thanks, but especially and with profoundest gratitude would I acknowledge the kindness of Prof. Dr. Richard Paul Wülker, who has helpfully guided me from the beginning to the end of my course here.

April 1885.

JAMES HAMPTON KIRKLAND.

THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

STALL STUDY
CHARGE

WIDENER
BOOK DUE
JAN 12 1984
1658170

WIDENER
BOOK DUE
NOV 10 1987
AUG 27 1988
CANCELLED
2318218

12413.22
A study of the Anglo-Saxon ... The
Widener Library 003406215
3 2044 086 718 053